

Full and Easie  
SATISFACTION  
WHICH IS THE  
T R U E  
AND  
SAFE RELIGION.

In a CONFERENCE

Between } D. A DOUBTER,  
              } P. A PAPIST, and  
              } R. A REFORMED CA-  
              } THOLICK CHRISTIAN.

---

In Four Parts :

- I. The true stating of our Difference, and opening what each Religion is.
- II. The true easie and full Justification of the Reformed or Protestant Religion.
- III. The Protestants Reasons and Charges against Popery, enumerated.
- IV. The first Charge, viz. Against Transubstantiation made good: In which Popery is proved to be the SHAME OF HUMANE NATURE, notoriously contrary to SENSE, REASON, SCRIPTURE and TRADITION, or the Judgement of the Antient and the Present Church; devised by Satan to expose Christianity to the Scorn of Infidels.

---

By Richard Baxter.

---

London, Printed, for Nev. Simmons, at the Princes  
Arms in St. Pauls Church-yard. 1674.

NOTES

Group	Age	Gender	Height	Weight	Body Mass Index	Waist Circumference	Waist-Hip Ratio	Trunk Flexion	Trunk Extension	Trunk Rotation	Trunk Flexion-Extension	Trunk Rotation-Extension	Trunk Flexion-Rotation	Trunk Extension-Rotation	Trunk Flexion-Rotation-Extension
Group 1	25	Male	175	75	24.2	35	0.85	15	10	10	15	10	15	10	15
Group 2	25	Female	165	65	23.8	30	0.80	10	5	5	10	5	10	5	10
Group 3	25	Male	180	80	24.7	38	0.88	20	15	15	20	15	20	15	20
Group 4	25	Female	170	70	23.9	32	0.82	12	8	8	12	8	12	8	12
Group 5	25	Male	178	78	24.4	36	0.86	18	12	12	18	12	18	12	18
Group 6	25	Female	168	68	24.0	31	0.81	11	7	7	11	7	11	7	11
Group 7	25	Male	182	82	24.9	40	0.90	22	17	17	22	17	22	17	22
Group 8	25	Female	172	72	24.1	33	0.83	13	9	9	13	9	13	9	13
Group 9	25	Male	176	76	24.3	37	0.87	19	14	14	19	14	19	14	19
Group 10	25	Female	166	66	23.7	29	0.79	9	6	6	9	6	9	6	9

100

NOV 1968

[illegible]

1674

B355

11

BY Richard J. Dwyer.

1. The first of these is the fact that the



To his Grace the Duke of Lau-  
derdail His Majesties Commis-  
sioner, and Principal Secreta-  
ry for the Kingdom of Scot-  
land, &c.

---

*May it please Your Grace,*

**H**ONOUR and Gratitude are affe-  
ctions much inclined to speak  
out, and to publish themselves  
in the predication of their objects: And  
seeing the Literate Tribe have long  
used so much boldness with Great  
Names, as to prefix them by Dedicati-  
ons to their Writings, I take that ad-  
vantage to tell the world how greatly  
Your favour hath long since obliged me,

and still continueth so to do. And while I can say, that I know of no Nobleman living who hath read more of my Writings than You have done, all that know the End of Writing, will consent, that there is no Noble Name which I should prefer. And as I long ago read in the Learned Spanhemius's Dedication of his *Dubia Evangelica* p. 3. to You (well joyned with the famous Usher), the predication of Your *Judicium Supra ætatem maturum, rerum omnium cognitione subactum pectus*, and that as attested by the Illustrious Duke of Rohane, the Most Sagacious Arbiter of ingenies; And years and experience have been long adding to Your knowledge: Being not a stranger to the Truth of this my self, I have great reason to be Ambitious to stand right in Your esteem: (For who reverenceth the Judgement of ignorant Readers? Or doth not reverence the Judgement of the Wise?) And therefore to give You an account of my self and of this writing;

Since

Since I overgrew that Religion which  
is taken up most on humane trust, by in-  
creasing knowledge I increased mens  
displeasure; and my judgement not  
falling just into the mold of any Sect  
among Church-dividers, there is scarce any  
Sect which doth not, according to their  
various interests, signifie their displea-  
sure. Some only by *Magisterial Censures*;  
more credibly acquainting the world, what  
they are themselves, than what I am, or  
what is my judgement. But from others  
I take a meer slander for Clemency, and  
as *Philostratus* saith, *de Dicto Phavorini*,  
*Et dum Socratis cicutam non bibam, aere*  
*primari statuâ non ledit.* Simple Christi-  
ty is my Religion: I determine to know  
nothing but Christ Crucified, (and Glori-  
fied.) And I am past all doubt, that  
till simple Christianity become the terms of  
Church-Unity and Concord, the Church will  
never see Unity or Concord, which shall  
prove universal or durable. So certain am I,  
that the Wits of the Learned, much less  
of

of the Community of vulgar Christians, will never arrive at the stature, of Concord, in numerous and difficult points: Nor the marvellous diversity of Educations, occasions, temperatures and capacities, be ever united in any thing but what is plain and simple. And as Certain am I, that the Universal Conscience of true believers will never unite, in any thing which is not evidently divine. And yet as certain am I, that the forsaking of the determination of the Holy Ghost and the Apostles, Acts 15. 28. and of Pauls Decision, Rom. 14. & 15. hath been the Engine of Church-Divisions and many calamitous distractions to this day: And that that blessed Prince who must have the honour and comfort of beginning the true healing and Concord of the Churches, must pare off all their superfluities, and leave them at best among their things indifferent, and unite them on the terms of simple Christianity.

And as to Popery I have certainly found,

found, that the Cross *Interests* and *Passions* of Disputers have made us (though really too distant) to seem commonly about many *Doctrinals* more distant than indeed we are: And that it had been better with us, if such men as judicious Ludov. le Blank, had had the stating of our Controversies at the first, that differing words and methods might not have passed with either side for damnable errors in the faith. I mean in the points of fore-knowledge, predestination, providence, predetermination, concurrence, original sin, free-will, universal Redemption, sufficient Grace, effectual Grace, the nature of Faith, Justification, Sanctification, Merit, Good Works, Certainty of Justification, and of Salvation, Perseverance, &c. For my knowing this to be true, I am censured by those on one extream, as too favourable to the Papists (being indeed an Enemy to injury, calumny, uncharitableness or cruelty to any in the world.) But I am much more displeasing to the

Roman party; Because I know, that One man is naturally uncapable of being the Monarch of all the world: That the King of Rome (as the *Geographia Nubiensis* calls him) was never by Christ made King of Kings and Lord of Lords: That he never was, nor can be a Pastor at the Antipodes, and over all the Earth, or as far as Drake and Candish did Navigate: That it's a sorry Argument, [Monarchy is the best Government: Ergo, An universal Monarchy is best:] That the Government settled in Nature and Scripture, is for Princes to rule Churchmen and all, by the Sword, and the Pastors of all particular Churches, to rule their Congregations by the Church-Keys, that is, by the Word, using Synods for due concord and correspondence: And this much will do better than all the stir that the Clergies Ambition hath made in the world.

I know that the Pope standeth on no better a foundation than the other four Patriarchs: And that he was but the  
chief

chief Prelate or Patriarch in one Empire, as  
the Archbishop of Canterbury is in En-  
gland; And that the Greek Church never  
took his Primacy in that one Empire to  
be of Divine Right: For if they had,  
they had never set up the Patriarch of  
Constantinople against him, who never  
claimed his Primacy as *jure Divino*. I know  
that the great Council of Chalcedon de-  
creed, Act. 16. Bin. 734. [“ We fol-  
“ lowing alwayes the definitions of the  
“ holy Fathers and the Canon, have  
“ our selves also defined the same  
“ things, concerning the Priviledges of  
“ the same Most Holy Church of Con-  
“ stantinople, New Rome; For to the Seat  
“ of Old Rome because of the Empire of  
“ that City, the Fathers consequently gave  
“ the Priviledges: And the one hun-  
“ dred and fifty Bishops most beloved  
“ of God, being moved with the same  
“ intention, have given equal Privi-  
“ ledges to the Most Holy Seat of New  
“ Rome: Reasonably Judging that the  
“ City



“ City adorned with the Empire and  
“ Senate, shall enjoy equal Priviledges  
“ with Old Regal Rome. ]

I know that their late Bishop of  
Chalcedon saith ( against Bishop Bram-  
hall, Survey, pag. 69. ) [ To us it sufficeth,  
that the Bishop of Rome is St. Peters Suc-  
cessor ; and this all Fathers testifie. But  
whether he be so jure Divino vel humano  
is no point of faith. Vid. Bellarm. 1. 2. de  
Pont. l. 12. And Holden Analys. fid. l. 1. c. 9.  
p. 161. Multa sunt quæ traditione universa  
firmiter imituntur ( puta S. Petrum fuisse  
Romæ ) quæ revelata non sunt ; ideoque ab  
articulorum fidei Catholica numero exclu-  
duntur.

I know that there never was such a  
thing as a true Universal Council in the  
world ( unless Christ and his Apostles  
were such ) ; nor ever must, or will, or  
can be.

I know that they were called Univer-  
sal but as to one Empire : and that Empe-  
rours called them together, who had no-  
thing



thing to do without that Empire; and that (unless accidentally any inconsiderable number) no Churches out of the Empire were summoned, or sent their Bishops thither: Which needs no other proof than the knowledge of the limits of the Roman Empire, and the *Notitia Episcopatum*, and the Names subscribed to each Council in Binnius and the rest.

I know that long ago their Raynerius said (*Cont. Waldens. Catal. in Biblioth. Patrum Tom. 4. p. 773.*) [The Churches of the Armenians, and Ethiopians, and Indians, and the rest which the Apostles converted, are not under the Church of Rome.] And that Godignus and others make no doubt but the Abassines had the faith from the dayes of St. Matthew and the Eunuch.

I know that Theodoret. *Histor. Sanct. Patr. c. 1.* faith, [James the Bishop of Nisibis came to the Synod of Nice; for Nisibis then obeyed the Roman Empire.] Nothing can be more plain.

I know

I know that Jacob. de Vitriaco (and others) say (Hist. Orient. c. 77.) that [the Churches of the Easterly parts of Asia alone exceeded in number the Christians either of the Greek or Latin Churches]. And that Brochardus that lived at Jerusalem saith, that [those called Schismatics by us are far better men than those of the Roman Church.]

And to perswade the Kings of other Kingdoms, that the necessary way of Church-Union, is to unite all their Subject-Churches under the Patriarchs of another Empire, is no wiser than to tell all the world that they must be under the Bishop of Canterbury.

I know that it was long ere Our antient Britains, and especially Your Scots, would so much as eat with the Roman Clergy, (as Beda sheweth.)

And I know, that their Metch. Canons saith, (Loc. Com. cap. 7. fol. 201.) [That  
“not only the Greeks, but almost all the rest  
“of the Bishops of the whole world have  
“fought

"fought to destroy the priviledges of the  
"Church of Rome; And indeed they had  
"on their side both the Arms of Emperours  
"and the greater number of Churches: And  
"yet they could never prevail to abrogate  
"the power of the One Pope of Rome. I  
Was this Pope then (or the Roman  
Church) Universal? Besides that, to  
this day, they are but about the third or  
fourth part of the Christian world.

And I know that General Councils are  
their Religion: and what the General ap-  
proved Council at Lateran sub Innoc. 3. hath  
Decreed against Temporal Lords and their  
Dominions, and absolving of their Subjects  
from their Oaths of Fidelity: Besides what  
Greg. 7. hath said in his Concil. Rom.  
of his power to take down and set up  
Emperours.

The knowing of these things, maketh  
me taken for their enemy. And their  
Image of Worship in an unknown Tongue,  
with their Bread-Worship and multi-  
tude of ludicrous deceitful toyes, are things  
which

which my soul can never be reconciled to: Much less to that renunciation of *humanity* which hereafter I detect, in the following Treatise.

And having given You this *Account of my self*, I add as to this *Treatise*,  
1. It grieved me to hear that so many refused the Parliaments Declaration against Transubstantiation: And I desired to shew them *what it is*.

2. Instead of joyning with those who talk much of the danger of Popery in the Land ( to keep it out, ) I thought it better to *publish the Reasons which satisfy me against it*, and leave the success of all to God.

3. And having occasion to re-print the First Part of my *Key for Catholicks*, with *Corrections*, instead of the Name before prefixed, ( of one whose face I never saw, nor ever had a word from, but ignorantly endeavoured to have provoked him to do good ) I thought *Your Name* fittest to be gratefully substituted

tuted, who were the *first* then that checked  
my *imprudent temerity*.

Though I was not so vain, as to expect of late in your multitude of greater business, that You should read over my *more tedious* Writings, I despair not but You may find leisure in perusing *this*, to see that I have prefixed Your Name to nothing, but what *Sense* and *Reason* and *Religion* do avow. And so Craving Your Pardon for the boldness and tediousness of this Address, I rest,

Your Graces humble much  
obliged Servant,

August 27.  
1673.

Richard Baxter.

---

To

and who were the first to be  
my independent remedy.  
Though I was not so vain, as to ex-  
pect of late in your minds of great  
or business, that you should not over-  
my more tedious writings, I do not  
but you may find leisure in reading  
this, to see that I have professed your  
Name to nothing, but what is true  
Reason and Religion do avow. And so  
Craving Your pardon for the tedious  
and tediousness of this Address, I am

Yr Obedt Servt  
John Gower

Aug 27  
1672

Richard Baxter

To

TO THE  
READER.

**T**His Dialogue cometh not to you, from an apprehension of any extraordinary excellency of it, as if it did much more than is already done: but as extorted by mens necessity; 1. Because so many ignorantly turn Papists of late; 2. And some are pleased to Say (I dare not say, To Think) that it is long of men in my condition; 3. And it is the Art of the Papists (which our vanity encourageth) to seek to bring the old Books into oblivion (which are unanswerable) and to call still for new.

The intended Use of this is, 1. To tell those that will dispute with a Papist, on what terms and in what order to proceed, lest they be cheated into a snare.

2. To teach the Ignorant Doubters truly to understand, wherein the difference between us and the Papists doth indeed consist; that the talk of Sectaries Calling that which displeaseth them, Popery, nor the scandal of our real or seeming divisions, may not delude them, nor Papists puzzle them by putting them to prove every word in our thirty nine Articles or other Writings.

3. To Resolve all that will be Resolved, by Senses, Reason, Scripture, or the Judgement and Tradition of the Church.

Of the multitude of Reasons against Popery enumerated, I have here made good but one, by a special disputation; because I would not make the Book too big. The rest I shall easily prove in another Volume, if greater work and shortness of life do not hinder it; (which I fully expect.) And lest I have no more opportunity to answer their Charges against us on the other side, I have reprinted and added (Corrected) the first part of my Key for Catholicks, where it is long ago done, and never answered. There is extant



one Piece of theirs against me, unanswered,  
called, Mr. Johnson's Rejoynder about the  
Visibility of the Church: which I seri-  
ously profess I have left unanswered, as ut-  
terly unworthy of my precious Time, till I have no  
greater matter to do, which I hope will never  
be. And he that will well study his opening  
of the terms in the latter end, will see to how  
pitiful a case they are reduced. I conclude  
with this solemn Profession, That I am sa-  
tisfied of the truth of what I write, and must  
dye ere long in the faith which I here profess,  
and lay my hopes of endless happiness on no  
other way: And that I would joyfully receive  
any Saving Truth, from Papists or any other,  
who will bring it me, with such evidence as  
may make it indeed my own. The Lord  
Unite us by Truth, Love and Humility.  
Amen.

Septemb. 1.

1673.

Richard Baxter.

one Time of their aggraving me, and  
 called, Mr. Johnson's Rejoynder about the  
 Villainy of the Church: which I for  
 my part I have left unanswered, as an  
 unworthy of my name. I have no  
 greater name to be which I have will never  
 be. And be that will well judge of speaking  
 of the terms in the last, will see to do  
 justice a case they are related. I conclude  
 with the solemn Vow, that I will be  
 true to the end of the world, and will  
 do as long as I live, what I shall  
 and to my best of ability, support on no  
 other way: And I will justify it  
 my saying, that I will be as true as  
 who will be to me, with your love as  
 may make it, which my dear, I shall  
 thank you by I am, I love a family.

September 1.  
 1672.

Richard Baxter.

# THE CONTENTS.

---

## PART I.

**W**hat is the Protestants Religion, and what the  
Papists? pag. 1.

Chap. 1. The occasion of the Conference : with an  
humbling consideration to staggerers. ibid.

Chap. 2. The Conditions of the Conference. p. 6.

Chap. 3. What is the Religion of the Protestants. Of  
the name Protestant : The Augustans and other Con-  
fessions : The thirty nine Articles : The Essentials of  
Christianity to be distinguished from the Integrals  
and Accidentals. p. 9.

Chap. 4. What is the Papists Religion : out of Veron,  
Davenport, &c. p. 25.

## PART II.

Fourteen Principles in which the Papists and Protestants  
seem agreed; by which the Protestant Religion is by  
the Papists confessed and maintained to be all true.

p. 40.

## The Contents.

### PART III.

*Twenty five Charges against Popery enumerated, to be all in order proved; as Reasons why no one that hath Religion, or Sense and Reason, should turn Papist.*

p. 61.

### PART IV.

*The first Charge made good, viz. against Transubstantiation: In which Popery is fully proved to be the shame of Humane Nature; contrary to SENSE, REASON, SCRIPTURE and TRADITION, or the Judgement of the antient and the present Church; devised by Satan to expose Christianity to the Scorn of Infidels.*

p. 75.

*Chap. 1. The first Reason to prove that there is Bread after the Consecration, from the certainty of the Intellectuals Perception by the means of sense, ibid. Twenty Reasons against the denying of common senses.*

p. 77.

*Chap. 2. The Papists Answers to all this confuted.*

p. 88.

*Chap. 3. The second Argument against Transubstantiation from the contradictions of it.*

p. 96.

*Chap. 4. The third Argument from the certain falshood of their multitudes of feigned Miracles in Transubstantiation. Thirty one Miracles in it enumerated; with Twenty aggravations of those Miracles.*

p. 99.

*Chap. 5. The Minor proved, viz. That these Miracles are false or feigned.*

p. 110.

Chap.

## The Contents.

Chap. 6. Arg. 4. Transubstantiation contrary to the  
express Word of God. P. 117.

Chap. 7. Arg. 5. All these Miracles are proofless: yea,  
the Scripture abundantly directeth us otherwise to ex-  
pound, This is my Body. P. 123.

Chap. 8. Arg. 6. Transubstantiation nullifieth the Sa-  
crament. P. 128.

Chap. 9. The Novelty of Transubstantiation, as con-  
trary to the faith of the ancient Christians: And the  
singularity, contrary to the Judgement and Tradition  
of most of the Christian world. P. 132.

Chap. 10. The second part of the Controversie: That  
it is not Christs very flesh and blood into which the  
Bread and Wine is turned. P. 146.

Chap. 11. The Conclusion: The Scandal of our disfe-  
rence removed. Whether the faithhood of our Article  
prove the Papists foundation false? Whether it do  
so by the Protestants? Whether Papists have any more  
Infallibility than others? The necessity of discerning  
the Essentials of Christianity. The distinction of Ex-  
plicit and Implicit faith considered. How come so  
many Princes, Nobles, Learned men, and whole Nati-  
ons to be Papists? All Christians besides Papists, are  
of one Church, though of many opinions. How come  
so many among us at home of late inclinable to Po-  
pery? What hope of Concord with the Papists? How  
to help them off their Councils? Silence in the point  
of Transubstantiation. Of their damning the Cate-  
chism the Laity. P. 152.

## ERRATA.

Reader,

I Hope the Printers *Errata* are not many, and I am discouraged from gathering them, because I see men had rather err themselves, and calumniate the Author, than take notice of them: So hath Mr. *Danvers* done by me in a Book against *Infant Baptism*, where as an Introduction to abundance of mistakes in History, he abuseth his Reader by several scraps of a Book of mine, so curtail'd as to be insufficient to signifie the sense, And among them seigneth me to write (*Chr. Direct. p. 3. pag. 88. l. 13.* [ *to InSTITUTE Sacraments* ] as that which man may do, instead of [ *Nor to InSTITUTE Sacraments* ]; and so maketh his credulous flock to believe that I assert that very thing which I write against: Though the place was markt with a *Star* in the *Errata*, and the Reader desired specially to Correct it. But such dealing is now grown so common with such men, that we must bear it as the effect of their disease.

## PART. I.

*What is the Protestants Religion, and what the Papists.*

---

## CHAP. I.

*The occasion of the Conference.*

D. **S**IR, I am come to crave your help in a matter of great importance to me: I was bred a Protestant; but the Discourses of some Roman Catholics, have brought me into great doubts, whether I have not been all this while deceived: And though I cannot dispute the case my self with you, I desire you to dispute it in my hearing with a Catholick Priest whom I shall bring to you.

R. With all my heart: But let me first ask you a few Questions.

*Quest. 1.* Did you ever understand what the Protestants Religion is?

D. I take it to be the 39 Articles, Liturgie and Government of the Church of *England*.

R. No wonder if you be easily drawn to doubt of that Religion which you no better understand. Can you hold it, and not know what it is?

*Quest. 2.* Do you know what it is to be a Christian?

D. It is to believe in Christ, and to Love and obey Him. Our Baptism is our Christening.

R. Very true: And in your Baptism you are Dedicated and Vowed to God the Father, Son, and Holy



Ghost; renouncing the Lusts of the Flesh, the World and the Devil.

*Quest. 3.* And have you been a true Christian, and lived according to this Vow? Have you obeyed God more than the desires of your flesh? Have you preferred the Kingdom of Heaven before all the pleasures, honours and riches of this world? Have you sincerely submitted to the healing-saving Doctrine, Law and example of Christ, and to the sanctifying motions of his Holy Spirit? And have you lived soberly, righteously, and Godlily in the world, and made it your care and business to deny your self, and mortifie all fleshly inordinate desires, as it is the care of sensual men to gratifie them?

*D.* I have had my faults as all men have; but I hope none can say but I have lived honestly towards all; And if I have been faulty in drinking, sports or gaming, it hath been to no ones injury but my own.

*R.* I ask you not whether you are a *sinner*; For so are all men. But whether you

are a *truly Penitent, Converted sinner*; and whether yet you are *true* to your *Baptismal Vow and Covenant*? Can your Conscience say, that you *Love, and Trust and obey God, and your Redeemer*, before all the world; and that you love

not Pleasure, Riches and Honour, more than God and Holiness and Heaven? and that it is more of the care and business of your life, to Know and Love and serve God better, and to make sure of your salvation, than to please your flesh, or prosper in the world? In a word; Do you heartily and in your practice, take God for your God, even for your All, and Christ, for your Teacher, King and Saviour, and the Holy Ghost for your Sanctifier, turning

*Johns. Nou. Repr. p. 426.* Protestants formally such, have not enough to be brought to the unfeigned Love of God above all things, and special Love to his servants, and unfeigned willingness to obey him: I deny you have any certain knowledge or feeling that you love God or his servants, or willingness to obey, &c.



turning in heart and life, from the Devil, the world, and the sinful pleasures of the flesh? This is the question which I desire you to answer.

But I will prevent your answer lest you mistake my purpose, and think I make my self your Confessor, and I will tell you why I ask the question.

Either you have thus *Kept your Baptismal Vow*, by a *Godly life*, or else you have *broken it* by worldliness and sensuality, &c. If you have *kept it*, and are a truly *Godly person*, you have resolved your own doubt, and absolutely confuted Popery already. For no honest man and true Christian can possibly turn Papist without gross contradiction.

D. How prove you that?

R. Most easily: I pray you do but mark: 1. It is their principal Doctrine that the Pope is the Head of the Universal Church on earth; and that the Church subjected to him, is the Universal Church; and that out of that Church there is no salvation; and that no one is a true member of Christ and his Church, who is not a subject of the Pope.

2. And they all confess that every one shall be saved that is a true Christian, and keepeth his Baptismal Covenant, and that Loveth God above all. So that they must needs hold that none in the world but Papists, do truly Love God, & keep that Covenant, and are true Christians.

Now if you can know that you have the true Love of God, and are true to your Baptism, you must needs confess that Popery is false, which saith that none Love God above all but Papists.

D. But what if I have not Loved God, and obeyed him, above my flesh?

R. I'll tell you what followeth. 1. It is no wonder if you forsake the Protestants Religion, who never truly entertained it. If your *Heart and Life* were not de-

*voted unfeignedly to God, you were no true Christian, nor indeed had any true Religion at all : And he that hath no Religion, turneth from none which he truly had. If you were never a true Christian, you were never a true Protestant : And then what wonder if you turn Papist ? For you have no experimental Knowledge of that Religion which you seem to forsake.*

2. And how could you expect better, but that God should penally forsake you, and give you over to believe deceits, if you have dealt so falsely and deceitfully with him, as to live to the world and flesh which you renounced, and neglect that God and Saviour and sanctifier to whom you were so solemnly devoted ? And if you have been so treacherous and unwise, as to prefer a brutish transitory pleasure, before Gods Love and the Joies of Heaven ?

3. And what honour is it to the Church of *Rome*, that none but Infidels and false-hearted hypocrites, and perfidious breakers of their Covenant with God, did ever turn to them ? If you turn Papist, you confess that you were a wicked hypocrite before.

4. But the chief thing which I would tell you is, that turn up and down as oft as you will, to this Church or that Church, to this side or that side, you will never be saved, unless you become a *holy, serious, mortified Christian*. As long as you love pleasures, wealth and honour more than God and Holiness and Heaven, you shall never be saved, whether you be Papist, or a professed Protestant. It would make the heart of a Christian ake, to see so many thousands cheated by the Devil, to take this opinion or that opinion, called the *true faith*, and this side or that side, called the *true Church*, to be to them instead of a *holy heavenly heart and life*. And how many thousands, especially Papists, that are truly of *no Religion*, do dispute, and plot and disquiet the world,

world, as *for Religion*. To hear a prophane man swear that his Religion is right; or that man to think to be saved for being of the true Church and *faith*, whose heart was never set on Heaven, but liveth in drunkenness, lying, idleness, fornication, and thinketh that the Priests absolution sets all right again. Without true Holiness no man shall be saved, what Church soever he joyn with; and with it no man shall be damned. For God cannot hate them that have his nature, and Image.

*D.* Well sir: I came not to dispute with you, but to desire you to meet a Roman Catholick Priest, that I may hear you both together.

*R.* I have the greater hopes of you, because you have so much regard of your soul, as to be willing to hear what can be said. For most that turn to them, never come to an impartial tryal, but rashly follow the deceiver, or stay till they are secretly hardened by false insinuations, and then take on them to desire to hear both, when they are first resolved to be gone.

But you must tell me what is the question that you desire should be disputed.

*D.* I would know whether the Papists or the Protestants be the True, and safe Religion?

*R.* I undertake to give you that plain undeniable evidence for your resolution, which should fully satisfy any reasonable man, at least that professeth himself a Christian: So be it you will perform these reasonable conditions: 1. That you will be impartially willing to know the truth. 2. That you will honestly resolve to Live according to it when you know it, and to be True to the True Religion. 3. That you will bring such a man to confer with me, who will yield to the Reasonable Conditions of a disputant, such as your Doubt and the nature of the matter doth notoriously require, and not a Knave,

and studied Deceiver, who will set himself purposely to hide the truth.

D. These conditions are so reasonable that I must not deny them.

## CHAP. II.

*The Conditions of the Conference ; between a P. and R. and D.*

R. **S**IR, I am desired by this person, who is brought by some of you to doubt of our Religion, to debate this Case with you in order to his satisfaction, *Whether the Papists or the Protestants be the True and Safe Religion?*

P. That is too large a Question : We cannot dispute of all our Religion at once : I will begin with you, about some one of the Articles of the Church of *England*, or the Visibility of your Church in all Ages, or the Resolution of your faith, &c. And this I will do only on these conditions, 1. That you bring some express Text of Scripture, which without your Interpretation, Reasonings or Consequences, doth assert that Article of yours which I shall accuse, or contradict any Article of our faith, which shall be questioned. 2. Or if you will go from the express words to Reasoning, that we keep to the strictest Rules of Logick, and that you use nothing but Syllogism, and that all be done in writing, and not by word of mouth.

R. Neighbour D. you promised me to bring another kind of Disputant : You hear his conditions : you shall hear my answer.

1. The Case which you told me you were in doubt of, and desired satisfaction in, was *Which is the True*

*and Safe Religion?* This he refuseth to Dispute, Pretending that we cannot dispute of our whole Religion at once. But did you never hear him give any Reasons against our Religion? If he have, Why can he not do it now? I expect not all in a word, but let him give them one by one, and say his worst. I am sure I can give you many against theirs: And we will after debate them particularly as largely as you please.

2. If *Writing* be it that you desire for your satisfaction, I ask you, whether you have read all, or the fourth part, of what is written against Popery already. Have you read Dr. *Challoner* of the Catholick Church? Dr. *White*, Dr. *Field*, Dr. *Downname* of Antichrist, *Chillingworth*, Dr. *Abbot*, Dr. *Willet*, Bishop *Usher*, Bishop *Morton*, Dr. *Strickland*, and an hundred more? Why should I expect that you should read what I shall write, if you will not read what is written already?

3. Can you stay so long unresolved without injury to your soul, till he and I have done writing? You cannot but know, that from Sheets we must proceed to the writing of Volumes, in answering each other, as others have done. And this is like to be many years work, for men that have other business: And how know you that we shall all Live so long?

4. Are you able when it cometh to tedious Volumes to examine them, and find who is in the right? Or will you not rather take him to conquer, who hath the last word? And it's like that will be the longest liver?

5. And as to a strict syllogistical form, do you understand that best? I avoid it not, but shall consent to use it as far as you understand it. Do you know all the Logical forms of arguing, all Moods and Figures, and all the fallacies? Or do you not perceive, that you have broken your promise with me, and brought a

friend of darkness, who cometh purposely to hide the truth?

D. I must needs profess, that the Question which I would have debated, is, *Which is the True and Safe Religion?* And that it is not tedious writings, nor long delays, but present conference which must satisfie me. And that it is plain Scripture and Reason that must satisfie me, who understand not Logick. I pray let me hear your own *Conditions* which you think more just,

R. The *Conditions* which the nature of the Cause directeth us to, are these.

I. That we first truly state the question to be disputed: For we cannot dispute till we are agreed of what: That is, 1. That we agree what we mean by our [*Religion*]; and 2. That I tell you, what is the Religion of Protestants, which I undertake to defend: And that he tell us what is the Religion of the Romanists, which must be compared with it.

I I. That our Conference consist of these several parts.

1. That premising the principles in which we are agreed, I tell you the Reasons why you should not be a Papist.

2. That he tell you the Reasons why you should turn Papist, or what he hath against Our Religion.

3. That then we come to dispute these Reasons distinctly: where I will prove *my* charges against them, and he shall prove *his* charges against us one by one.

I I I. And that in all our disputes, we shall consent,

1. Not to interrupt each other in speech; but if the length seem to overmatch the hearers memory, we will take brief Notes to help our memories, as we go, and crave the recitation of what shall be forgotten: For the strength of Truth lyeth so much in the connexion of its parts, that when it is mangled into scraps by uncivil inter-

terruptions, it is deformed and debilitated and cannot be well understood,

2. That we bind our selves by solemn promise, to speak nothing which we unfeignedly judge not to be truth, nor any thing designedly to hide or resist the truth which we discern,

These terms are so just and necessary, that I will avoid him as a fraudulent wrangler who will deny them. For I come not to scold, nor to try who hath the strongest Lungs, the nimblest Tongue, or the lowest voice, or the greatest confidence, or fiercest passion; but to try who hath the truth, and which is the true way to Heaven. For the servant of the Lord must not strive; especially about words and barren notions; for that doth but tend to increase ungodliness.

D. Your Method is so reasonable, and so suited to my own necessity, that I must profess no other can so much tend to my satisfaction: And therefore I hope it will not be refused.

(Here after long opposition, the P. at last agreeth to these terms ).

### CHAP. III.

*What is the Religion of the Protestants.*

R. I. **T**He word [*Religion*] is sometimes taken Objectively; And so I mean by it; [*The objects of Religious Belief, Love and Practice,*] which are, 1. The *Things themselves*; which are the *principal objects* (called by Logicians, The *Incomplex terms.*) 2. The *organical object*; or the *Revelation* of these Things; containing 1. The *Words* or other *Signs*: 2. The *sense* or *notions* signified.

For



For instance, Matth. 17. 5. [ *This is my Beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.* ] Here 1. The *Real Incomplex object* is *Christ Himself*, the beloved Son of God, and God the Fathers well-pleasedness in him. 2. The *signal part* of the organical object, or Revelation, is the *Words themselves*, as *spoken* then, and *written* now. 3. The *signified notions* are the *Meaning* of the words, and are the chief part of the *organical object*, that is the *Divine Revelation*.

The word [ *Religion* ] is of larger extent in its sense than [ *Faith* ]; For it containeth all that Revelation which God hath made Necessary to salvation; which is twofold, 1. That which is to inform the *understanding* with necessary *knowledge* and *faith*. 2. That which is necessary to a *Holy Will* and a *Holy Life*, to the Love of God and man, and to well doing; which are Precepts, Promises and Threatnings.

I. I. The word [ *Religion* ] is oft taken also *subjectively* ( as they speak ); For the *Acts* and *habits* of *Love* and *Obedience*.

Now I suppose we are agreed that it is not *Religion* in this last sense that we are to dispute of ( which is as divers as persons are: ) But it is that which we call *Objective Religion*, even the *Organical part* directly. And if by all this *D.* understandeth us not, in plainer words, our Question is, *Of the True Divine Revelation*, viz. *Which is the True Rule of Faith, Will and Practice*; that which is held to be such by the Protestants: or that which is held to be such by the Papists?

*P.* I grant you, that this is the state of the Question.

*R.* I here declare to you then, *What is the Religion of the Protestants.* IT IS THE LIGHT and LAW OF GOD CONCERNING HOLY KNOWLEDGE and BELIEF, HOLY WILL and PRACTICE.  
CON-



# CONTAINED IN NATURE and THE TRUE CANONICAL SCRIPTURES.

Here note 1. That our Religion hath its *Essential* parts; And its *Integral* parts and *Accidentals*. I. The *Essentials* of our Religion, are contained in the *Baptismal Covenant*; which is expounded in the CREED, the LORDS PRAYER, and the DECALOGUE (as delivered and expounded by *Christ*, and the *Law of Nature*.)

II. Our *Entire Religion*, in the *Essentials*, *Integrals* and *needful Accidentals* is contained wholly in the *Law of Nature* and the *Canonical Scriptures*.

The *Essentials* are delivered down to us two wayes: 1. In *Scripture* with the rest; 2. By the *sure tradition* of the *Universality of Christians*, in *actual Baptizings*, and the *daily profession of Christianity*. This is all the *Protestants Religion*. If you fasten any other on us, we deny it; we own no other. And none know What is *my Religion*, that is, *What I take for the Rule of my holy Faith, Love and Life*, so well as *my self*.

P. This is meer craft: you will make that only which is past controversie among us, to be *Your Religion*, that say your Religion may be past controversie too.

R. It is such Craft as containeth that *naked truth*, which we trust all our own salvation on. I say that *I have no other Religion*; And if you know better than I, disprove me.

P. I disprove you three wayes. I. Because the *Name Protestant* signifieth no such Religion, but somewhat else larely taken up. II. Because the *Anglicane Confession*, the *thirty nine Articles* and such like, are by your selves called *The Articles of your Religion*. III. Because all your Writings declare, that besides these, you hold all those *controverted points*, which are *contrary* to that which you call *Popery*.

R. I

R. I pray you mark *D.* that he would persuade you that *he knoweth my Religion* better than *I do myself*? What if I should pretend the like as to *his Religion*? Were I to be believed?

P. No: but if you have an odd Religion of your own, that proveth it not to be the *Protestant Religion*.

R. Remember *D.* that *I come not hither to persuade you* to any other Religion, than this which I have mentioned. Let him talk as long as he will what is *other mens opinions*, I persuade you to nothing but this, to take *Gods Law of Nature* and the *Scripture for your Religion*. Either this is *Right* or *Wrong*. If *Right*, fix here and I have done. If *Wrong*, let that be disputed.

But yet I open to you all his three decits.

I. The name *Protestant* doth not signifie *our Religion*, but our *Protesting* against the *Papists corruptions* and *additions*. I have no Religion but *Christianity*: I am

Knot against *Chillingworth Ch. 2. p. 122*, [ *In no one doctrine Protestants would seem more unanimously to agree, than in this, That all things necessary to salvation are contained evidently in Scripture, which they hold as the only foundation of the whole structure of their Faith and Religion.* ] Note this Confession.

a *Christian*, and that signifieth all my Religion. I am a *Catholick Christian*, that is, of the *Common Christian Faith and Church*, and not of any *heretical dividing Sect*: And I am a *Reformed Protestant*

*Christian*, because I renounce *Popery*. Therefore I rather say [ *The Protestants* ] than the [ *Protestant* ] Religion. As if I were among *Lepers*; If I say, I am no *Leper*, that signifieth not my *Essence*: But if I say, [ *I am a Man, and I am not a Leper,* ] I speak my *Nature*, and my freedom from that *disease*. So if I say I am a *Christian Protestant*, I mean only that I am a *Christian*, and no *Papist*, or renouncing *Popery*; as by the word [ *Catholick* ] I renounce all *Sects and Schisms*. I tell you, *This is my meaning*, when I say, I am a *Protestant*.

*Protestant* : and can you tell my meaning better than my self?

I 1. And as to what he saith of the *thirty nine Articles* and other Church Confessions, I answer, *None of these are our Religion*, in the sense now in question; that is, They are not taken by us to be [ *the Divine Revealed-Rule of our Faith, Love and Life* ] which is *our Religion* now disputed of. And that this is so, I prove to you past all question.

For 1. Else should we have as many *Religions* as we have *Church Confessions*, and should alter our Religion as oft as we alter our *Confessions*; and our Religion should be as *New* as those *Confessions*: All which the Protestants abhor.

2. All those very Confessions themselves do assert that *Gods Word is our only Religion*, and all mens Writings and Decrees are lyable to mistakes: To pass by all the rest, these are the words of our sixth Article, [ "*Holy Scripture containeth all things Necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of faith, or be thought Requisite or necessary to salvation* ]. What would you have more plain and full?

And in the Book of Ordination, it is askt [ "*Are you perswaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation? through faith in Jesus Christ? And are you determined out of the said Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge? and to teach Nothing (as required of necessity to eternal salvation) but that which you shall be perswaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture?* ] Is not this plain?

P. Why then do you call the *thirty nine Articles* the *Articles*

*Articles of your Religion ? And what is their use ? And why are all required to subscribe them ?*

R. 1. Their Use is to signify how the Conjoint Pastors who use them do *understand* the Holy Scriptures in *those points* : And that partly for the satisfaction of all *foreign Churches*, who may hear us accused of Heresie or Error, and partly to be a hedge to the Doctrine of *young Preachers*, to keep them from vending mistakes in the Churches, and also to try the soundness of their understandings.

2. The Confessions, and Articles, and Catechisms are our Religion, as the Writings of Perron, Bellarmine, Suarez, &c. or many of these agreeing, are the Roman Religion: They are not the Divine Revelation and Rule of faith and practice to us : But they are the expression of our own conceptions of the sense of several chief matters in that Rule or Revelation. So that they are the Expression of our faith or Religion taken subjectively (for acts and habits) and not our objective Rule at self. Our Sermons and Prayers are our Religion in this sense; that is, The Expression of our own Religious Conceptions: And so are your Sermons and your Writings also to you. But if this were our Rule of Faith and Life, and to our Divine Objective Religion, then we should be of as many Religions, as we are several persons: For every one hath his several Expressions: And every new Sermon, or Book, or Prayer, would be a new part of Religion. And so with you also. So that this doubt is past all doubt: Our Confessions are but the expressions of our personal belief, and not our Rule of Faith.

III. And as to your third pretence (that we have other Articles as opposite to Popery) I answer, Our Religion as a Rule of Faith and Worship is one thing. And our Rejecting all Corruptions and Additions is another.

ther. E. g. My Religion is, that our God is only the true God. If now I say also, that *Hercules* is not God, and *Bacchus* is not God, and *Venus*, *Mars*, *Mercury*, *Pallas*, *Neptune*, *Pluto*, *Ceres*, &c. are not Gods; is this a new Religion, or an addition to the former? If the *Baptismal Covenant* be the *Essentials* of my Religion, and the *Creed*, *Lord's Prayer* and *Decalogue* the *Explication* of it, and if the *Scripture* be my *Entire Religion*, and if the *Papists* will come and add a multitude of new *Articles* and *Corruptions*, my rejecting of those additions, is no more an alteration of my Religion, than the sweeping of my house, or the washing of my hands is an alteration of them. So that notwithstanding all that you have said, my Religion is nothing but the *Law of Nature and Scripture*, and my rejecting of *Popery*, is no otherwise my Religion, than my freedom from the *Leprosie*, &c. is my *humanity*.

P. Observe, I pray you, that It is no part of your Religion to be against *Popery*.

R. Observe I pray you, that *Popery* is against my Religion, that is, against much of the *Christian Religion*; and therefore my Religion is against *Popery*. But I will not quarrell with you about words: When God hath Revealed to us his *Will*, and the *Papists* add their corrupting inventions, Gods Revealed Will is my Religion: your Corrupting additions are contrary to it: Call my rejecting such *Corruptions* and *additions*, by the name of my Religion *Reductively* (as *Nihil* is *objectum Intellectus*, & *Malum Voluntatis*; and as *non-agere* is part of obedience); or Call it no part of my Religion in the *primary* notion, but a *Rejecting* of its *contraries*; so we understand each other I care not.

The truth is, the *Rejecting* of some of your errors, directly contradicting the *Scripture* it self, may be called part of our Religion, as the *Negation* of the *Contrary*

trary is included in the sense of an Affirmative : But your remoter additions, are contrary to our Religion, but not so directly. For instance : when the Scripture saith, *There is bread after Consecration*, and you say *There is no bread* : My Religion containeth the Assertion, that *There is bread* : And so includeth a contradiction to your Negative, that saith [ *There is none* ]. Now to say, that It is none of my Religion to deny your Negative, who say *There is no bread*, would import that It is none of my Religion which affirmeth that *there is bread*. Contradictions cannot both be true : Properly that word that saith *There is bread* is my Religion : But this word contradicteth you that say *There is none*.

But in another instance, my Religion saith, that *The Righteous shall go into life everlasting, and the rest to everlasting punishment* ; and tells us of a *Heaven and Hell* only hereafter : And you tell us of *Limbus Patrum & Infantum*, and of *Purgatory* : The Scripture enableth us by consequence to confute this : but if it did not, it were enough for me to say, *It is none of my Religion*, because not Revealed by God in *Nature or Scripture* ; And as it is your *Addition*, so to deny it, is not directly and properly my Religion it self, but the *Defence and Use* of my Religion. God tells us in Scripture, that *He created Heaven and Earth*. If one should assert as from God, that God created *ten thousand Heavens and ten thousand Earths*, this is a faith of his own invention or addition, and it is enough for me to say, *I have no such faith* ; because God revealeth no such thing. So that still the Scripture is the Protestants Religion as your *Polydor Virgil* truly describeth them, and others confess.

P. All this is meer delusion : For It is not the words, but the sense that is your Religion ; as you will confess. And if your Articles or Confessions contain  
a false



a false sense, or your Books or Sermons shew that you falsely expound the Scripture, your Religion is then false.

R. Such Confusion may cheat a heedless hearer. But any one that will take heed, may quickly perceive, that you here fraudulently play with the ambiguity of the word [*Religion*] and quite turn to another question. For you now speak of subjective Religion, that is, of the Acts and habits of the person: whereas we are disputing only of objective Religion, which is Gods Revelation and our Rule. If I understand any Texts of Scripture amiss, my faith is so far defective in myself. But Gods Word, which is my Rule, is never the more imperfect.

I pray you consider now justly you have spoken, 1. Is a mans Act of faith, Gods Word or Revelation? 2. What need you dispute of the Protestants Religion, if we have as many Religions as persons? For it is as certain that we have as many degrees of our understanding many Texts of Scripture? 3. Would not this prove also as many Religions as persons among yourselves? Is it not most certain that no two Papists in the world, have just the same sense or conceptions of the Scriptures and Councils in each particular. The Law of God is my only Religion, objectively, as now disputed of. If I mistake any essential part of it, so as to deny it, I am personally a Heretick. If I mistake any integral part, I so far err from the Rule of my Religion or faith. But I still profess, that I take Gods Word or Law only for my sure unchangeable Rule or objective Religion, and I am daily learning to understand it better, and as soon as I see my error I will reform it, and blame my self, and not my Rule. And I think you will say the same of your Rule and of your personal errors.

And pray you consider how shall we say this



P. This shall not serve your turn: For every Law must have its *promulgation*: And if it be not *manifested* to you that Scripture is Gods Law, and sufficient, it cannot be your Rule: I ask you therefore,

Q. 1. Is it the Scripture in the *Original*, or in the *Translations*, which you say is your *Religion*, *Law* or *Rule*?

R. I told you our Divine Rule consisteth of *Words* and *Meaning*. It is only the *Originals* which are our *Rule* or *Religion* as to the very words: that is, Only the *Original words*, were of that *Divine Inspiration*. But every *Translation* is so far Gods Word, in *sense*, as it expresth truly the *sense* of the *original words*.

P. Q. 2. I pray you what then is the *Religion* of all the unlearned Protestants, who know not a word of the *Originals*? They may see now that you have stripped them of all *Divine Religion*.

R. Their *Religion* is the same *objectively* with that of the most learned, as *delivered from God*: but it is not *equally learned* and understood by them: Gods Word in the *Original Tongues* is given them as the *Rule* of *Faith* and *Worship*; and *Teachers* are appointed to help them to understand it. When these *Teachers* have *Translated* it to them, they have the same *sense*, though not the same words, for their *Religion*. And to know the Words is not so necessary to salvation, as to know the *sense* (or sentence) though by other words: For the words are but *means* to know the *Sense*; and the *sense* but a *means* to know the *Things*, *viz.* God, Christ, Grace, Glory, &c. And as they have the same God, Christ, Spirit, Grace, Glory, &c. to be the *real objects* of their *Religion*, so have they the same *Doctrine* and *Law* in *sense* which is in the *Originals*.

P. Q. 3. And I pray you, How shall the unlearned be

be sure that the Translations are true as to the sense? when you have no Divine Infallible Translators?

R. I also ask you. 1. How was all the Greek Church for many hundred years sure of the soundness of the Translation called the Septuagint? or that of *Aquila, Theodor. Symmachus, &c.* when it is certain that in many things they were all unsound?

2. How was the *Latine Church* sure of the soundness of their Translation before *Hierome* amended it? And how have you been sure since then, when *Pope Sixtus*, and *Pope Clement* have made so many hundred alterations or differences? Had you then *Infallible Translators*? And why then do your Translators (as *Montanus* and others) still differ from that *Vulgar Latine*?

3. And how do all your unlearned persons know that you give them not only the true sense of the Scriptures, but of all your Councils or Traditions?

But I will answer you directly. We still distinguish the *Essentials* of our Religion, from the *Integrals* and *Accidentals*. 1. The unlearned may be certain that the *Essentials* are truly delivered them in sense: Because they have them not only in the Scripture, but by *Universal certain Tradition*, in the constant Use of *Christian Baptism*, and in the use of the *Creed*, *Lords Prayer* and *Decalogue* in all the Church-assemblies: And they may easily know that mens tempers, Countreys, Interests, opinions in other points, and sidings are so various, that it is not a thing possible without a miracle, that all these should conspire both in a false Translation, and *Universal assertion* and *Tradition* of all these *Essentials*. For the effects must be contrary to a torrent of Causes: The *Papists*, *Protestants*, *Arians*, *Greeks*, *Soci-nians*, *Lutherans*, *Calvinists*, *Anabaptists*, *Separatists*, &c. have so much animosity against each other, that undoubtedly if any party of them did falsifie Scripture even

in the *Essentials* which are easily discerned, multitudes would quickly detect it and contradict them. And this the *unlearned* may surely and easily discern.

But as for all other *less necessary texts* of Scripture, neither you nor we, *learned* or *unlearned*, are *certain* that they are *perfectly translated*, nor are they by any one *perfectly understood*, nor are they *sure* (by reason of the *various readings*) which *copie* of the original is *absolutely faultless*.

2. But suppose that an *unlearned weak Believer* were not *absolutely certain* (as he may be) that the very *essentials* of *Christianity* are truly opened to him, he may yet grow up to better understanding, and he may be saved with *some doubtings* of *Christianity* it self, so be it his Faith be *more prevalent* than those doubtings, upon his Heart and Life.

P. Is it a safe Religion which you your self describe? When no man can be sure that he rightly understandeth all the Scriptures? and when your believer is uncertain, even of *Christianity* it self? Let D. Judge whether this be a sure Religion.

R. The word of God is *absolutely certain in it self*; but that so much uncertainty may be in *believers*, I will make you to your shame confess your self, and recant these insinuations.

Q. 1. Dare you say that *all your Church*, or *any one man*, even the *Pope himself*, doth understand *all the Scripture*? or can *perfectly and infallibly translate each word*? You dare not say it. Else why did he never once pretend to give us either an *unerring Commentary* or *Translation*? And why have you such great diversity of both?

Q. 2. How much less dare you say that any of you perfectly understand *all the Councils*, which are the rest of your Religion? No nor that you have *certainly* which

which are the true Copies of them all? else why do *Caranza, Crab, Surinus, Binnius, Nicolinus, &c.* give give us such various Copies? And yet you confess the *Scriptures* to be *Gods word*, and with the *Councils* to contain your Religion.

Q. 3. If God have promised *salvation*, to all that truly hold and practise the *Essentials* (the *Baptismal Covenant*) doth the difficulty of other points (in *Genealogie, Chronologie, History, by-matters*) either make our *salvation* ever the less certain, or any way impeach the word of God? What disgrace is it to a man that besides *Head and Heart*, he hath fingers, and toes, and nails and hair? No more is it to the *Scripture*, that as our entire Religion, it containeth even *Integrals* and *Accidentals*.

Q. 4. And as to a *Doubling Believer*, I ask, Dare you say that all those were Infidels or in a state of damnation, who said, *Lord increase our faith?* or *Lord we believe; help our unbelief?* or to whom Christ said, *Why are ye afraid O ye of little faith?* or that said, *Luk. 24. We trusted that this had been he that should have delivered Israel?* Or if a man should doubt even of the *Lifeto come*, and yet his Faith be so much more powerful than his doubts, as that he resolveth to prefer his hopes of *Heaven* before all this world, and to seek it on the most self-denying terms, even to the laying down of life it self, are you sure that this man shall be damned? But this is the Course of pievish wranglers. To maintain their own opinions and put a face of certainty on their own conclusions, they stick not to damn almost all the world. For it will be no less, if all doubting believers must be damned.

See the Roman *fact.* where this is confest, *Ca. 1. q. 1. pag. 9.*

5. It is a gross delusion to pretend that there is a necessity, that *All Gods Infallible word*, must needs be taught us by as *Infallible Inspired Prophets* or other persons, as those that first delivered it. Translation is but the first part of *exposition*. And must we have none but *Infallible or Prophetical Expositors*?

6. Is it *All the Scriptures*, or but *some part*, that your Pope or Councils can *Infallibly* both translate and expound? If but *some*, we need not their Infallibility or Inspiration, for the *most plain and necessary* parts: It is and can be done without them. If it be *All*, how impious and cruel are they that would never do it to this day?

7. And why use all your Expositors the common helps of Grammars, Lexicons, Teachers, long studies, and yet differ *de fide* (even of the sense of many a text of Scripture) when all is done, if your Pope have the gift of Infallible Translating and expounding all?

P. Remember that your selves derive your *Essentials* from *Tradition*.

R. Yes, and our Integrals to: What objective presence to the senses, (eyes and ears) of those that heard Christ and his Apostles, and saw their miracles was to the first Converts in those times, that partly *Tradition* is to us, or the necessary medium.

He that would know what stress we lay on Tradition as the Medium may see it fully in my *Reasons of Christ's Relig.* And Dr. Holden is more for us than for the Papists, *Cas. 3.*

The words could not come down to us, without some to deliver them. We have the *Bible by Tradition*, and we have *practical Tradition of Baptism* and the *Creed by it self*, and that in many languages; where we are sure we have all the necessary sense. But do you remember that this is

Uni-

*Universal Tradition, and not meer Roman Tradition; such as is certain by moral Evidence, even the consent of all that are yet of cross opinions and Interests, (as to matter of fact); Historical Evidence; and not the pretended certainty of a Pope and his favourites, pharisaically claiming a spirit of Infallibility.*

But I am not now disputing with you, I am only telling you that the *Protestant Religion is nothing but Christianity and the Scriptures.* And all our *Confessions* are our Religion (besides Consent) but as our *Sermons* and *Treatises* are, which vary as they are various expressions of mens various subjective faith, while *Gods word* varyeth not.

P. If the *Bible* be your Religion, then the *Ceremonial Law of Moses* is your Religion: For that is part of the *Bible*.

R. You study what to say against another, and never think how it concerneth your selves. 1. Is not the *Bible* at least Part of your Religion? You dare not deny it. And is the *Ceremonial Law of Moses* therefore your Religion?

2. I told you that as a perfect man hath hair and nails, which are but *Accidents*, so the *Bible* hath more than the *Integrals* of our Religion.

3. The *Ceremonies* of *Moses* in that sense as now they are delivered to us in the *Bible*, are parts or *appurtenances* of our Religion: That is, the *historical narrative* of those *Abrogated Laws*, which now bind us not as *Laws*, but tell us (as the *Prophecies*) what was *heretofore*, and how *Christ* was fore-typified, and what intimations of *Gods will* we may gather from the history. And the *abrogated Laws* are no otherwise delivered to us, and so we must use them.

P. If the ten *Commandments* be your Religion, you must keep the *Jewish seventh day Sabbath*:



so that neither there can you fix,  
 R. The same answer will serve. 1. The ten Com-  
 mandments are no otherwise part of *our Religion* than  
 they are of *yours*. 2. They are a *Law to us*, as deli-  
 vered and expounded by *Christ*, and in *Nature*: and the  
 seventh day is an abrogated part of *Moses Law*.

P. If the *Creed* be your Religion, you must take the  
 Article of *Christs* descent into *Hell* to be necessary to  
 salvation.

R. 1. Is the *Creed* no part of *your Religion*? As you  
 answer, so may we. 2. I did not tell you that the  
*Creed* had *no more* than the *Essentials*. I told you that  
 all the *Essence* of *Christianity* is in the *Baptismal Cove-*  
*nant*: And he that understandeth that, understandeth it  
 all. And that the *Creed*, the *Lords Prayer*, and the  
*Christian Decalogue* are the *exposition* of it. But the  
*Exposition* may have *somewhat more* than the *Essenti-*  
*als*. 3. The *Creed* was not written first in *English*,  
 nor *Latine*; And *Christs* descent to *Hades* is more  
 needful to be believed, than his descent to *Hell*, as the  
 word is commonly taken in *English*.

But, to conclude, remember, 1. That I profess here  
 to own and plead for *no other Religion* (as we ex-  
 plained the word) but *Gods Law of Nature and*  
*Scripture*. 2. That I profess to persuade *D.* to *no*  
*other*: And you cannot make me a Religion against  
 my will.

CHAP.



## CHAP. IV.

*What is the Papists Religion.*

**R.** I Have plainly told you what my own, and the Protestants Religion is, viz. [*Nothing but Christianity; contained Integrally in the holy Scriptures; And the Essentials being the Baptismal Covenant, explained in the Creed, Lords prayer and Christian Decalogue, are delivered to us both in the said Scriptures, and by distinct Tradition; which also hath brought down to us the Scripture it self: Not a Tradition depending on the pretended Authority of the Roman Pope or party, or on any other that shall pretend the like; But that Historical Evidence of matter of fact, which is surer given us by all sorts of Christians, taking in the Concord of many Hereticks, Infidels and Enemies; which evidence dependeth not on the credit of supernatural Revelation, but on the natural credibility yea and certainty of such universal Circumstantiated Concordant testimony; and is necessarily antecedent to the Belief of supernatural Revelations in the particulars, as sight and hearing were in the auditors of Christ and the Apostles; seeing these two Acts of Knowledge, [Whatever God saith is True; and This God saith] must necessarily go before our Belief or Trust that [This is True, because God saith it.] And so we run not in a circle, and need not a supernatural faith, for the founding of our first supernatural faith; that is, A first before the first.*]

*Without fraud or obscurity this is our faith and Religion.*

Now do you as honestly and plainly tell me *What is Yours*, which D. must be perswaded to: For I confess that

that I take it to be an *unintelligible* thing, and despair that ever you give any man a certain notice, what it is, which may be truly called the Religion of your Roman-Catholick-Church. VI 9 A H S

P. I shall make you understand it if you are willing: But 1. Note that [*Religion*] being a larger word than [*faith*] includeth also [*Practice*] or [*Manners*], we must give you a distinct account of each: For they have not the same Causes: Our *Faith* is *Divine*; But our *Manners* or *Practice* must follow the *Laws* of the *Church*, as well as the *Immediate Laws* of *God*: These must not be confounded.

R. Man hath three faculties, *Intellective*, *Volitive* and *Vitally-Executive*, or *Active*: Our *Religion* subjectively must be in all, viz. The Sanctity of all, by *Holy Life*, *Light* and *Love*: And therefore the *Rule* which is our *objective Religion* doth extend to all, (to *Intellect*, *Will* and *Practice*). And surely for *All*, there is a *Rule* directly *Divine*, given by *Inspiration* of the *Holy Ghost* or *Christ's* own words, and *subordinate Rules* by *Christ's Ministers*, which are directly *Humane*, and no otherwise *Divine* than as *God* hath in *General* authorized them thereto. Even as the *Sovereign* hath the only *Universal Legislative* power, and *Magistrates* by *Him* are authorized to *subordinate mandates* and acts of *Government*. And so we have a *Divine Faith* and *Revelation*, and a *subordinate Humane faith* and *Ministerial Revelation* or *Preaching*: We have *Divine Perswasions*, and *subordinate Perswasions* of men: We have *Divine Laws*, yea and *executions*; and we have *Humane subordinate Laws* and *executions*. If you resolve to call the *Humane*, *Divine* so far as they are indeed *Authorized* by *God*, I will not quarrel about words: But remember, 1. That so you must do also on the same reasons, by the *Laws* of *Kings* and the *Commands* of *Parents*,

*Parents*, who are as much authorized by God to their proper Government. 2. And I hope you mean not to Confound these *Humane Laws*, with *Gods own Universal Laws*, nor *humane faith* with *Divine faith*. And be it known to you, It is the *Divine Revelations* and *Laws* as distinct from the *Humane*, which we are now calling our *Religion*, and disputing of; though this *Religion* teach us to obey *Parents*, *Pastors* and *Princes*, and that obedience may be consequentially and reductively called *Religious* if you please. But if really your *Religion* be not *Divine*, but *Humane*, let us know it. For by the word [ *Religion* ] we essentially mean that which is [ *Divine*. ]

P. Men were the speakers and writers of the Scriptures, and so far they are humane, as well as the Decrees of the present Church.

R. The Decalogue was witten by God, and delivered by the Ministry of Angels: Christ was owned by a Voice from Heaven. And himself spake and did most recited by the four Evangelists: And the Prophets and Apostles spake by the immediate Infallible Inspiration of the Holy Ghost: So that the Holy Ghost is the Author of the Scriptures. But the present Pastors of the Church instead of that Immediate Revelation from God by the Spirits Inspiration, have but the ordinary help of the Spirit, to understand those same Revelations, and that proportioned to the measure of their diligence, natural parts and helps of Art, as the knowledge of Theologie is attained by other Students; who are none of them perfect or free from error.

P. I will tell you what our Religion is, It is Gods Word concerning things to be Believed and Done delivered partly in the Canonical Scriptures, and partly by  
Oral

*Oral Tradition, and received by the Church, and by it delivered to us. The Trem.*

2. Was it from the Church that the first Church received it? Or was it not the same Divine Religion which the first Church (whether Council or Practicers) received without the Tradition of Council or Practicers? If so, this cannot be essential to Religion. If the Apostles words were to be believed, their proved Writings are to be believed. And their Writings were proved theirs before a General Council or Universal Practice witnessed it: Even by each Church and person that received any Epistle from any one of them.

*Catech. Prefac. q. 12, saith, Omnis doctrina ratio, que fidelibus tradenda sit, verbo Dei continetur, quod in Scripturam, Traditionesq; distributum est. The Reason of every doctrine which is to be delivered to the faithful, is contained in the Word of God, which is distributed into the Scripture and Traditions.*

Vide Concil. Senonens. in Bin. Decr. 5. p. 671. & Concil. Tridentini Sess. 4. p. 802. — *Perspiciensque hanc Veritatem & disciplinam contineri in libris sacris, & sine scripto Traditionibus, que ex ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis accepta, & ab ipsis Apostolis Spiritu sancto dictante quasi per manus tradita, ad nos usque pervenerunt, orthodoxorum patrum sententiam sequuta, omnes libros tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti, nec non Traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus a Christo, vel a Spiritu sancto dictatas, & continua successione in Ecclesia Catholica conservatas, pari pietatis affectu & reverentia suscipit ac veneratur.*

*Bellarmin. de Verbo Dei, lib. 4. c. 2, 3, sheweth the divers sorts of unwritten Traditions which are part of Gods Word: some de fide, as the perpetual Virginity of Mary, that there are but four Gospels, &c. and some of Manners; as Crossing, Fast-dayes, &c. Easter, Whitsontide, and other Festivals.*

Veron de Reg. fid. cap. 2. faith, [ " The total and  
 " only Rule of the Catholick faith, to which all are,  
 " obliged under pain of Heresie and Excommunication,  
 " is Divine Revelation delivered to the Prophets and  
 " Apostles, proposed by the Catholick Church in her  
 " General Councils, or by her Universal practice, to  
 " be believed as an Article of Catholick faith. ] [ " All  
 " that is of this nature is an Article or doctrine of  
 " faith. And no other doctrine can be of faith, if  
 " either the first Condition fail, viz. Divine Revelati-  
 " on, or the second, which is a Proposal by the Uni-  
 " versal Church. ] p. 5. No doctrine grounded on  
 " Scripture diversly interpreted, either by the ancient  
 " Fathers or our Modern Doctors, is an Article of faith.  
 " For such a doctrine, though it may be revealed, yet  
 " the revelation is not ascertained to us, nor proposed  
 " by the Church.  
 " Nor any Proposition which can be proved only by con-  
 " sequence drawn from Scri-  
 " pture, though the con-  
 " sequences were certain and  
 " evident, and deduced from two propositions of Scri-  
 " pture. — Yet these doctrines are Certain, when  
 " the premises are so. — *Gratians* decrees, the  
 " Papal decrees contained in the body of the Canon  
 " Law, none of them do constitute an Article of  
 " faith. — Nor that which is defined in Provin-  
 " cial Councils, though the Pope preside in person —  
 " for the second condition is alwayes wanting in this  
 " case, and very often the first. — p. 11. I did not  
 " say that such definitions  
 " were not of faith —  
 " but they are not of Catho-  
 " lick faith, or which all as Catholics are bound

So that if the Doctors will but  
 differ in their Expositions, the  
 Scripture is no more the sure  
 Word of God, or to be believed  
 by Catholick faith.

Of the Pope with out a Generall  
 Council.

"to hold as of faith, and the contrary to which is  
 "heretical, and removeth from the bosome of the  
 "Church. — p. 12, 13. The

Mark then, that it may be *de fide*  
*divina*, though not of *Catholic*  
*necessity*, without the proposal of  
 Council or universal practice.

"Practice even of the Uni-  
 "versal Church is no suffici-  
 "ent ground for an Arti-  
 "cle of Catholic faith

"by reason the object of faith is Truth: and

"at times the Church proceeds in matter of practice,

"upon probable Opinions, and this probability is suffi-

"cient to justify the practice, which the Church on

"just cause may change: As e.g. as Vasquez teach-

"eth the Church did anciently pray in the Mass for

"Infidels alive, and Catechumens dead, and the Sacri-

"fice of the Mass was offered for them, and yet he

"rather inclineth to the contrary, that the Sa-

"crifice of the Mass ought not to be offered, but for the

"faithful living and dead, by which Opinion the

"Church seemeth guided at present. But Vasquez

"answers, that the Church following a probable opi-

"nion did practise that which she did not declare to

"be of faith. — p. 15. So General Councils

"when they mention any thing in this manner (by way

"of simple assertion) and do not properly define:

"For as Bellarmine affirms, it is necessary that Gene-

"ral Councils properly define the thing in question, as

"a Decree which ought to be held as of Catholic

"faith. Hence Bellarmine adds, they are not proper-

"ly Hereticks, who hold the Pope not to be above all

"Councils, though he say the last Laterane Council

"under Leo the tenth Ses. 11. expressly and professedly

"reacheth that the Pope is above all Councils, and

"rejects the contrary Decree of the Council of Basle:

"because it is doubtful whether the Laterane Council

"defined that doctrine properly as a Decree to be be-

"lieved



"liewed with Catholick faith. The same Bellarm. (de  
 "Concil. l. 2. c. 19.) also requireth that the definition  
 "be made Conciliarly: Pope Martin the fifth said, he  
 "only confirmed those Decrees of faith which were  
 "made in the Council of Constance, Conciliariter:  
 "that is, after the manner of other Councils, the que-  
 "stion being first diligently examined: But its clear  
 "(saith he) that this Decree, that a General Council  
 "hath immediate authority from Christ, which all  
 "even the Pope, are bound to obey, was made without  
 "any examining — p. 17. The object defined must  
 "be truly and properly an object of faith: and a  
 "Decree ought to be on a thing universally proposed  
 "to the whole Church — Vazquez holds: It is  
 "not at all erroneous to affirm that a General Coun-  
 "cil may err in Precepts, and in particular Judge-  
 "ments — and (p. 19.) in framing Laws nor  
 "necessary to salvation, or making superfluous Laws —  
 "Without all doubt, a General Council may err in  
 "question of fact: (which depends on testimony and  
 "information of men;) So the first General Council  
 "condemned Honorius of Heresie by false Information,  
 "and misunderstanding his Epistles. — p. 20. The  
 "Pope (saith Suarez) to a particular action belonging  
 "to humane Prudence, hath no infallible assistance of  
 "the Holy Ghost — As that such or such an excom-  
 "munication is valid, or that such or such a Kingdom  
 "is disposab[e] by the Pope for such and such causes. I  
 "So far Heron, who is most favourable to you, in nar-  
 "rowing our faith:

R. Thus far you have resolved me: but I must crave  
 somewhat more. Q. I. Are there no Essentiall Con-  
 stitutive parts of your Religion more necessary than  
 the Integrals and Accidental[s]? Have you no descrip-  
 tion for it, but that It is Divine Revelation proposed by



the Church? The Doctrine of Sacrificing was a Divine Revelation to Adam, and the difference of clean and unclean Beasts to Noah, and the Jewish Law was Gods Revelation to Moses and them: And yet I suppose Christianity is somewhat different from all these. Is not Christianity your Religion? Hath Christianity no Constitutive special Essence, but only the Genus of Divine Revelation which is common to that with all other Divine Revelations? And what if you add [to a Prophet or Apostle]? Was Agabus Prophecie of Paul, or Pauls of the event of the shipwreck, &c. essential to Christianity? Hath Christianity no Essence? Or is all Divine Revelation essential to it?

P. You take advantage of the disagreement of our Doctors. You know that

Johns. Nov. Rep. f. 19. of the explication of Terms. And you note, that Divines are divided, what are the points necessary to be believed explicitly, necessitate medij. Some, and these the more ancient hold, that the explicit belief of Gods, of the whole Trinity, of Christ, his Passion, Resurrection, &c. are necessary necessitate medij. Others among the recentiors, that no more than the belief of the Deity, and that he is the remainder of our worship, is the salutely necessary with that necessity to be explicitly believed.

some few acknowledge *strict fundamentals*, and some deny the distinction in your sense. And most of us say, that no man can enumerate the things necessary to all, but that it dependeth upon mens various capacities, educations, and means of knowing. And in sum, that no more is necessary to all to be explicitly believed, but that

Gods Revelations are true, and that All are Gods Revelations which the Church proposeth as such.

You may take our judgement much from him that cometh nearest to you, whom I have heard you much praise, as most moderate and judicious. Viz. Dr. H. Holsten Anal. fid. l. 1. c. 5. Lect. 2. p. 53. [and] disputing of the necessity of points to be believed do commonly read this way, to denote the Articles of

"things revealed, the explicate and expresse Belief  
 "whereof, is (as they opine) altogether necessary to  
 "all Christians. The resolution of which question is  
 "among them so doubtful and uncertain, as that they  
 "are in this: (as ~~as~~ they are in all things else) di-  
 "tracted and divided into various Opinions: which  
 "they that care for them, may seek: To me they are  
 "as Nothing, while the Authors of them profess that  
 "they have nothing of Certainty. Yea, to one that  
 "meditateth the matter it self, laying by all pre-oc-  
 "cupation, it is most clearly manifest, that the Resolution  
 "of this question is not only *unprofitable*, that I say not  
 "*pernicious*, (as it is handled by Divines), but also vain  
 "and impossible. It is unprofitable, because no good ac-  
 "crueeth by it to souls. ~~as~~ It is pernicious, while Divines  
 "for the most part assert, that only *One* or *Two* Ar-  
 "ticles, yea, (as some say) no singular Article at all, is  
 "necessary to be believed of all by an explicate faith.  
 "For hence (however the truth of the matter be)  
 "the colder Christians taking occasion, do little care  
 "to obtain that degree of Knowledge in the Mysteries  
 "of faith, which they might commodiously and easily  
 "attain. It is *Impossible*, seeing it is Manifest, that no  
 "particular Rule or Points to be believed, or Number  
 "of Articles can in this Matter be given or assigned,  
 "which shall be wholly common and necessary to all  
 "Christians: For this dependeth on every individual  
 "mans natural capacity, means of instruction, and all  
 "the other circumstances of each mans life and dispo-  
 "sition, which are to each man so special, that we can  
 "determine of nothing at all that is common to all.  
 "But I handle the Necessity of points to be Believed  
 "in a far other sense: For the Articles of the Christi-  
 "an faith, which I now call necessary, I do not at all  
 "understand to be such as all and every one must dis-  
 "tinguishedly

"**finely know, or hold by explicite assent ; But I**  
 "mean only such, the belief of which is accounted  
 "universally by the whole Catholick Church, so sub-  
 "stantial and essential, as that he that will deservedly  
 "be esteemed, and truly be a member of it, must needs

*He doth better interpret the distinction of Explicite and Implicite, on another occasion, in another sense.*  
 "adhere to them all at least  
 "Implicitely and Indirectly :  
 "that is, by believing what-

"soever the holy and Univer-  
 "sal Church doth Catholickly believe and teach as a  
 "Revealed Doctrine and Article of divine faith. And  
 "therefore he is for that cause to be removed from  
 "his Communion and Society, who shall pertinaciously  
 "and obstinately deny the least of them, much more  
 "if he maintain the contrary, while he knoweth and  
 "saith that it is the Universal sentence of that Church,  
 "that we must adhere to that as an Article of faith. And  
 "in this sense I will henceforth use the word Necessary.

(As This might have been said in fewer and plainer  
 words, viz. That your Divines herein do commonly  
 err, and that perniciously, and yet that indeed he is of  
 the same mind, viz. that It is impossible to name the  
 Articles necessary to be believed explicite of all, be-  
 cause each man's divers capacity, means and circum-  
 stances diversifie them to each : But that only this one  
 thing is explicite to be believed, [That whatsoever  
 the Holy and Universal Church doth Catholickly be-  
 lieve and teach as a Revealed Doctrine and Article of  
 faith, is true.] And therefore that no man must per-  
 tinaciously deny any thing which he knoweth the  
 Church to holdeth. So that nothing is necessarily  
 to be believed actually and indeed, but Gods and the  
 Church's Veracity.

IT. Another of ours that cometh as near you as  
 most, openeth this more fully, *Davenport alias Br.*

" Sancta

*Santa Clara, De. Nat. Grat. p. 111, &c.* [“At to  
 “the Ignorance of those things that are of necessity of  
 “Means, or End, there is difference among the Do-  
 “ctors: For Soto 4. d. 5. q. 5. & li de Nat. & Grat.  
 “c. 12. & Vega l. 6. c. 20. sup. Trid. hold that now  
 “in the Law of Grace there is no more explicate faith  
 “required, than in the Law of Nature; Yea, Vega ib.  
 “& Gabriel 2. d. 2. q. 2. ar. 3. & 3. d. 21. q. 2. think  
 “that in the Law of Nature, and in Cases in the Law of  
 “Grace, some may be saved with only natural know-  
 “ledge; and that the habit of faith, is not re-  
 “quired. Whom *Horantius* terms men of great name;  
 “and will not accuse of heretic. I would this great  
 “mans modesty were more frequent with modern Do-  
 “ctors. Yea, *Alvarez de aux. disp.* 56. with others,  
 “seemeth to hold, that to justification there is not at  
 “all required the knowledge of a supernatural object  
 “(or the supernatural knowledge of the object.)  
 “Others hold, That both to Grace and Glory is re-  
 “quired an explicate belief of Christ. *Boyard* 3.  
 “d. 25. &c. Others, that at least to salvation is an  
 “explicate belief of the Gospel or of Christ, though  
 “not to Grace or Justification. And this is common  
 “in the Schools, as *Exera* shews that followeth it:  
 “And for this Opinion *Scorus* is cited — But I think he  
 “holdeth, that explicate belief of Christ or the Gospel, is  
 “not of necessity of means as to Grace or Glory, as  
 “4. d. 3. q. 4. What is plainer than that now  
 “men may be saved without the explicate belief of  
 “Christ — And I plainly think its *Scorus* and  
 “the common opinion, which *Vega* followeth, and *Fa-*  
 “ber 4. d. 3. and *Petigianis* very well, and of the  
 “Thomists *Bannes* 2. 2. q. 2. a. 8. *Cannus* and others: Yea,  
 “the *Trent* Council seemeth to favour it, *Sess.* 6. c. 4.  
 “— p. 114. So *Corduba*, *Medina*, *Bradwardine* —

"And such (as have no explicite faith in Christ.)  
 "are not formally without the Church. This way go  
 "Victoria in 4. Relect. 4. tit. Richard de Villa med. 3.  
 "25. d. 3. q. 1, &c.  
 "Well faith Perigianis 2. d. 35. q. 1. v. 9. that if  
 "there were a simple old woman to whom some false  
 "Opinion were preached by a false Prophet (e.g. that  
 "the substance of Bread remaineth with the body of  
 "Christ in the Sacrament) and she believe it: Doth  
 "she sin by this? No. — p. 119. Yea, if she so  
 "err through piety, thinking that the Church so be-  
 "lieveth, perhaps she should merit. — p. 120. For  
 "my part I think that the Vulgar committing themselves  
 "to the instruction of the Pastors, trusting of their  
 "knowledge and goodness, if they be deceived, it will  
 "be taken for invincible ignorance, or at least pro-  
 "bable, (as *Horera*) which excuseth from faulti-  
 "ness. — Yea, some Doctors give so much to the  
 "Instruction of Pastors, that have the care of the  
 "Sheep, that if they should teach, that *hic*  
 "*nunc* God would be hated, the rude Parishioner were  
 "bound to believe him: which yet I think false —  
 "p. 123. It seemeth at this day to be the common  
 "judgement of the Schools and Divines, that the Lairy  
 "erring with their Doctors or Pastors are altogether  
 "excused from all fault; Yea, oft times so mate-  
 "rially erring do merit for the act of Christian obedi-  
 "ence which they owe their Pastors: as you may see  
 "in *Valent. To. 3. disp. 1. q. 2. p. 5.* and others. So  
 "Angles 2. d. 22. q. 2. dub. 7. *Kasqu. p. 2. disp. 121.*  
 "In case they never doubted of the Veracity of their  
 "Prelates —  
 "Much more faith *Sancta Clara* there, to prove that  
 "the ignorant Protestants here may be saved, citing fur-  
 "ther to his end, *Zancher in Decal. l. 2. c. 1. v. 8. Alph.*  
 "a Castro,

*a Castro, Simanca, Argon, Tanner, Faber, Emmanisa, Rozell.* And out of *Argon* tells us when Faith is sufficiently proposed, viz. [ "When faith is so confirmed  
"by Reasons, holiness of life, the confutation of the  
"contrary errors, and by some signs, as that Reason it  
"self beginneth prudently to prescribe, that the mat-  
"ters of faith heard are to be believed, and the con-  
"trary Sect is false. ] p. 125.

"And *probl. 26. p. 127.* Whether men may be  
"blamelessly ignorant of the Law of Nature and the  
"Decalogue? The common opinion is that they may;  
"not of the first principles, but 1. Of the easie conclu-  
"sions for some time, and of the remoter conclusions  
"for a longer time: Such are the Commandments of  
"the Decalogue as to the substance of the act: as in  
"some lying, theft, fornication, manslaughter (in Will  
"at least) &c.

R. *Qu. II.* But do you think that men may not as  
invincibly and inculpably be unacquainted with the Au-  
thority of the Pope and Ro-  
man Councils or Church, as  
you say they may be igno-  
rant of Christ, and the Law  
of Nature? I instance in the  
millions of the *Abassine*  
Christians, who for above a  
thousand years never heard  
from the Pope or his  
emissaries.

P. That cannot be denied: For they have not the ne-  
cessary means.

R. How then do you make your Churches proposal  
to be the necessary point to be *Explicitely believed*  
of all?

P. We do not mean it of all that will be saved: For



you hear that some may be saved without any explicate belief of Christ. But we mean it of all that *will* be in the Church, and be saved *there*.

*R.* But do you not hold and say, that out of the Church there is no salvation?

*P.* Some say so: and some say that It is *rare* out of the Church,

*R.* But are the *Ethiopian* Christians out of the Church?

*P.* They are out of the true Church, being Schismatics.

*R.* Why said your Author before, that Infidels were not *formally* out of the Church who are invincibly ignorant?

*P.* But other Doctors are of another opinion.

*R.* But Christ is the Saviour of his body: Are not those of the Church who are saved, or in a state of salvation? What hold you of that?

*P.* Some say, They are all of the Church: and others that Christ saveth more than his Church: And some say, that They are of the Church Regenerate, but not of the Church Congregate. But few own this, because it is your distinction: as of a visible and invisible Church.

*R.* *Qu.* III. But above all, I would know of you, what you mean by the *Catholick Church*, whose proposal is necessary to the being of faith?

*P.* We mean the *Roman* Ca. holick Church: that is, the *Pope and his Subjects*.

*R.* Do you mean the Pope without a General Council, or a General Council without the Pope? or only both agreeing and conjunct?

*P.* You take advantage of our differences: but those do but shew, that this is no point of faith. Some hold that the Pope alone may serve: and some, that the Pope

in



in a Provincial Council : and some that a General Council without him : But you heard *Veron* taketh in the Council, and it is no true Council without the Pope : And therefore the surest opinion saith, that it must be both in Concord.

R. But what is the *Universal Church* whose Practice is made sufficient instead of, or without a General Council ?

P. It is the whole *Roman Church* real, distinct from the Representative.

R. Is it the Clergy only, or the Laity only ; or must it be both ?

P. Both, but not equally ; but in their several places.

R. Must it be *All* the Church, without any excepted ? Or only the greater part ?

P. These are points not agreed of, and therefore not of faith. Some say that it must be so many as that the dissenters be not considerable. But how many are considerable or inconsiderable is undetermined. Others say, It may be the minor part that practise, so be it the rest do not contradict it, or do contrarily.

R. I will trouble you with no more such questions, (though I have a multitude which should be here resolved) for I perceive that we must expect nothing but a Maze of uncertainties and confusion.

We are next in order to Agree upon our *Common principles* which must be supposed in our following Dispute : For they that Agree in nothing, are incapable of disputing of any thing ; seeing all conclusions of which we doubt, must be drawn from *undoubted truths*, of which we are less doubtful, and resolved into a conceded Principle.

## PART II.

*The Principles which Papists and Protestants are agreed in: And therein the full justification of all the Protestants Religion.*

**T**He first common Principle : *That we are Men; having Reason, and Free-will, and Sense; whose Natural way of knowing things sensible, is by the perception of our senses, having no way of greater Certainty.*

**R.** I take it for a common principle, that we are *Men, having Reason, and Free-will, and Sense*: whose natural way of knowing things sensible, is by the perception of our senses. And therefore that our rightly constituted or sound senses, with their due *media*, about their proper objects are to be trusted; being either certain, or we have no certainty.

**P.** I know what you intend : I grant it as you express it.

**R.** It must then be granted us, that there is *true Bread and Wine* in substance remaining after the words of the Mass-Priests consecration.

**P.** Yes: when you can prove, that the consecrated *Bread and Wine* are the proper objects of sense: which we deny; they being not now *Bread and Wine*.

**R.** Is it by the *Perception of sense* that you deny it? Or by other means?

**P.** No:

**P.** No : It is by Faith and Reason which are above Sense.

**R.** Now you come to deny the Principle which you granted: Sense is the perceiver of its own objects: No Faith; no Reason can perceive them; but by sense: And if *one sensation perceive them*, and Faith deny them, then Faith denyeth sense to be the proper natural perceiver of its objects, and our judgement of things sensible to be such as must follow that perception. But we must dispute of this anon, and will not now anticipate it. Only remember, that if you deny sense which is the first Principle, no mortal man is capable of disputing with you, there being no lower principle to which we can have recourse, and resolve our differences.

---

The second Principle: That there is One only God, Infinite in Being, Power, Wisdom and Goodness; Our Owner, Ruler and Chief Good; Most Holy, Just and True, and therefore cannot lye; but is absolutely to be believed, and trusted, and loved.

---

**R.** I need not repeat it: Do you not Agree with us in this?

**P.** Yes: Heathens (that are sober) and Christians are agreed in it.

**R.** You grant then, that this may be known by them that are no subjects of the Pope. Remember anon that we are not to be blamed for Believing God.

---

The

The third Principle: *That the whole frame of Nature within us and without us (within our reach) is the signal Revelation of God and his Will to man; called (Objectively) The Light and Law of Nature.*

R. I suppose that this also may pass for a common granted Principle,

P. Yes, as you express it: If we agree not of the Light and Law of Nature, we come short of Infidels, and meer Natural men.

R. Observe then, that we are Justified by your principles, for Believing and Trusting Gods *Natural Revelation*. The very first part of which is made to our senses: By *Natural Evidence* God sheweth us that Bread is Bread.

P. Yes: when sense is sound, and objects and media just, and God doth not contradict sense by supernatural Revelation.

The fourth Principle: *That Natural Revelation is before supernatural, and sense before faith, and we are Men (in order of Nature at least) before we are Christians; and the former is still presupposed to the later.*

R. This also I suppose is a granted Principle.

P. It is so: But see that you raise no false consequences from it.

R. I conclude from it, that He that denyeth the perception of sense to be the certain way of Judging of things

things sensible, denyeth all the Certainty of *faith*, and subverteth the very foundations of it: And that we are justified for our Assenting first to Gods Natural Revelations. It is God that made my *senses and understanding*, and God that made the *object and media*, as *Bread and Wine*, and therefore God deceiveth me, if I be deceived in taking it for *Bread and Wine* after Consecration. But God is to be *believed*, in his *first Revelations*.

P. You vainly call Sensation, and Intellection or Knowledge of things sensible by the name of *Believing*.

R. We will not vainly contend about the *Name*, if we agree of the *Thing*: But this leadeth me to another Principle.

The fifth Principle: *That the Knowledge of things fully sensible hath more quieting, satisfying Evidence, than our Belief of supernatural Revelations alone, as made to us by a Prophet or Apostle: And that where all the sound senses of all men living do agree about their near and proper sensible object, there is the most satisfying Evidence of all.*

R. I suppose that we are all agreed also in this principle.

P. As you word it we are: For our Divines distinguish of *Evidence and Certainty*: and are so far from saying that *Faith* hath more *Evidence* than *Sense and Knowledge*, that it is ordinary with them to say, that this is the difference between *Faith and Knowledge*, and that *faith* hath not *Evidence*: but yet it hath no less certainty.

R. Some men use words first to sport themselves out of their understandings, and then to use others

to

to the same game. *Evidence* is nothing but the *Perceptibility* or *Cognoscibility* of a thing: by which we call it *Knowable*; which is the Immediate necessary qualification of an *Object* of *Knowledge*. *Certainty* is either *Objective*, which is nothing but this same *Cognoscibility* or *Evidence* as in a *satisfying* degree: Or it is *Subjective* or *Active*, which is nothing but the *Infallible* or *True*, and *quieting satisfactory knowledge* of a *Truth*. Where the *Certainty* of *Object* and *Act* concur: For no man can be certain of a lye or untruth: For to be *Certain*, is to be certain that it is *True*: Those therefore would befool the world, who would perswade men, that a clear and confident perception of an untruth, or confident error, is *Certainty*. There may be *Objective Truth* and *Certainty* of the *Matter*, where there is not in us an *Active* or *Subjective* *Certain Knowledge* of it: But there can be no *Active Certainty* of an *Objective Uncertainty*, or *certain Knowledge* of a lye. Now if you mean that *faith* hath *Objective Certainty* without *Evidence* of *Certainty*, or *Ascertaining Evidence*, that is, but to *say* and *unsay*: It hath *Certainty* and no *Certainty*: For this *Certainty* and *Evidence* is all one. But if you mean that *Faith* hath an *Active Subjective Certainty* without an *Objective Certainty* in the *Matter*, you speak an impossibility and contradiction: as if you said, [ *I clearly see a thing invisible or without light.* ]

P. Do you think that our Divines knew not what they said, when they say that to believe without *Evidence* maketh *faith* *meritorious*?

R. The old asserters of this meant the same that Christ meant, when he saith to *Thomas* [ *Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.* ] There is a *sensible Evidence*, and an *Intelligible Evidence*. *Faith* hath not an *Immediate sensible Evidence*; that is, we be-  
lieve

*lieve things unseen, and above sense : And this is their meaning : We see not God, Christ, Heaven, Angels, &c. But faith hath alwaies Intelligible Evidence of Verity ; and ( as our Mr. R. Hooker saith ) can go no further than it hath such Evidence.*

However, I appeal to any that have not been disputed out of their wits, whether, If God would give us as full a *sight* of Heaven and Hell, and Angels and Blessed souls, as we have of the Bread and Wine before us, and as full a *Hearing* of all that they say, in justification of Holiness, or Lamentation of sin, and as full sensible acquaintance with the world we go to, and our title to it, as we have with this world, I say, whether this would not be more ascertaining and satisfactory to us, and banish all doubts, more than our present *faith* doth ? I love not to hear men *lie as for God*, and talk and boast against *their experience*, as if the interest of faith required it. Things revealed to faith *Are Certain and Infallible*. But that is because we have *certain evidence* :

1. That *God cannot lie* ; 2. And that *God revealed them*, and so that they are *True*. But if we did *see, feel, taste, &c.* we should be *more certain*. Else why is it said, that we *now know but enigmatically and as in a glass*, and as *children* ; but hereafter *shall see as face to face, and know as we are known, when faith is done away*, as being more Imperfect than *Intuition*. We have *evidence to prove*, that the Revelation made to *David, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Peter, Paul, &c.* were of God, and that their *words* are by us to be believed, &c. But to *see, hear, taste, feel, &c.* would be a more *quieting Assurance*.

Therefore when all the *sound senses of all men living*, perceive after consecration, that there is *Bread and Wine*, this *Certainty* is, 1. in order *antecedent to that of faith*, and 2. by *Evidence, more satisfying and assuring* than



than that of *meer faith*, as to a prophets Revelation; And therefore to reject it on pretence of *faith*, is a subversion of all natural methods of assurance; and is but pretended, I think, by your selves.

---

The sixth Principle. *That except those Immediate Inspirations which none but the Inspired do Immediately and clearly perceive, we have no Revelations from God, but by signes; which are created beings, and have their several Natures, and so may be called Physical, though signifying Moral things. And thus far our natural and supernatural Revelations agree.*

---

R. Every being is either *Uncreated* (which is *God only*) or *Created* (in a large sense, that is *Caused*.) What God Revealed to Christ, Peter, Paul, &c. we have knowledge of, but by *signes*: In Scripture these signes are *Words*: These words signifie partly the *mind of God*, and the speakers or writers, and partly the *matter spoken or written*. When it is said, that *It is impossible for God to lye*, it can mean nothing to us, but that it is impossible that God should make us a deceitful sign of his will. The voice of an Angel, Prophet, Apostle, a thousand Miracles, &c. are but *signes of the matter and of Gods will*: And if God can ordinarily make false *natural signes*, we are left unassured that he cannot make false signes by an Angel, or a Prophet, or a Miracle. And so all faith is left uncertain.

P. Then you will make God a lyar or deceiver when ever any man is deceived by natural signes.

R. Not so: For men may *deceive themselves* by taking those for *signes* of a thing which are *none*, and so by *misunderstanding* them. And the Devil and bad men

men may promote this deceit. But whenever God giveth man so plain a sign of the Matter and his Will, as that no error of an unsound sense, an unqualified object, a culpable or diseased fancy or Intellect, interveneth, then if we are deceived it can be none but God that doth deceive us; which cannot be, because he cannot lye. And as it is an unresistible argument against the Dominican doctrine of Physical Predetermination as absolutely necessary to all acts of natural or free agents, that If God physically predetermine every lyar to every lye, that is mentally conceived or uttered, then we have no certainty but he might do so by the Prophets and Apostles; so is it as good an argument against Papists, that if he ordinarily deceive the senses of all sound men by a false appearance of things seeming sensible, he may do so also by the audible or legible words of a prophet.

The seventh Principle. That he that will confute sense, and prove that we should not Judge according to its perceptions, must prove it by some more certain evidence that contradicts it.

R. I suppose you will not question this,

P. No. The word or Revelation of God is a more certain evidence.

R. How know you that there is any word of God? but by your senses?

P. But yet by sense I may get a certainty which is above that of things sensible. As I know by the world that there is a God, by a certainty above that of sense.

R. If that were so, yet if things sensible be your media, you destroy your Conclusion by denying them, and undermine your own foundation.

2. But

2. But it is not true : The knowledge of the Conclusion can be no stronger than that of the principles, even of the weaker of them. If you are in any uncertainty whether there be Sun, Moon, Heaven, Earth, Man, Beast, Heat, Cold or any Created sensible being, you must needs be in as much doubt whether there be a God that made them.

---

The eighth Principle. *That Believing or Assenting is an Intellection of the Truth of something revealed, and therefore must have Intelligible Evidence of Truth in the thing believed.*

---

R. I know that *Assiance* or *Trust* as it is the act of the Will, reposing it self quietly on the Believed fidelity of God, is not Intellection. But the *Assenting* act is an *Intellection* or an *Act of Knowledge* of a Verity; not as *Science* is narrowly confined to principles, but as *Knowledge* is taken in *genere* for *notitia*. So to believe is no other than to *know that this is true, because God saith it.* Joh. 6. 69. *We believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, &c.* Joh. 3. 2. *We know that thou art a Teacher come from God, for no man could do such works, &c.* Joh. 21. 24. *We know that his testimony is true* — See Rom. 7. 14. & 8. 28. 2 Cor. 5. 12. *We know that if this earthly house, &c.* 1 Tim. 1. 8. 1 Joh. 3. 2. Joh. 8. 28, 32. 1 Cor. 15. 58. *We know that our Labour is not in vain, &c.* Therefore your denying the certainty where the evidence is most notorious, and telling men of *Meriting* if they will but believe your Church, without any *Evidence* of certainty, is a meer cheat.

The ninth Principle: *That Jesus Christ is the Son of God and the Saviour of the World, and that Christianity is the true Religion, and Gods appointed sufficient way to Heaven, including Godliness, which is irrefragable part.*

R. By Christianity I mean both our Believing, Loving and obeying Christ as the way to the Father, and our Believing, Loving and Obeying God our Father, as the end of Christs Mediation. The Knowledge of God and the Mediator being *Eternal Life*, Joh. 17. 3. And as Taking a man for my Phyfician, is taking him, by his medicines to help me to my health, and so Health is finally included, so taking Christ for my Saviour, is to take him by faith to be the means of bringing me to the Love of God and to Glory. And so I include Godliness in Christianity, and the Law of Nature in the Law of Grace.

P. We are agreed on the truth of this, but not of the medium by which it must be made known to us.

R. At the present I ask no more than that we agree in Christianity as the true and sufficient Religion and way to life.

The tenth Principle. *That Baptizing is our Christianizing: And that all that are truly Baptized are Christians, and members of the visible Church, untill they Apostatize or are justly excommunicate (at least).*

P. I grant you all this as a common Principle with Christians.

R. Then you grant us, 1. That our Religion is the True Religion; of Gods appointment, sufficient to salvation: For it is *Christianity*, which you confessed to be such. 2. You grant that we are baptized into the true Catholick Church, which is the body of Christ.

The eleventh Principle. *That all that are truly Baptized have the pardon of all their sins, and have present right to salvation, if they so die.*

R. I mean, that they that are *Internally true* Conscience to the baptismal Covenant, and are baptized, have all these benefits of Baptism. And that Infants have them as *rightly dedicated to God and baptized*: Do not you Consent to this?

P. Yes, you know we do.

R. Then you fully grant, that all among the Protestants who in Infancy or at age are truly baptized are in a state of salvation: Why then would you make people believe that there is no salvation in our Churches, when you grant the right to all that are Baptized.

P. But you are not Baptized by lawful Ministers.

R. Take heed what you say: Your party holdeth that even Schismatics and Heretics Baptism is valid, if they have all that is essential to Baptizing in the doing of it: Yea that a lay mans, or womans baptizing is valid. If you deny it, I will shame you, by producing the common consent of your Doctors; and your censure of

of *Cyprian*, and making the contrary doctrine to be a Heretic.

*P.* But you have not all that is essential to Baptism, because you are not intentionally Baptized, into the true Catholick Roman Church : For while you are not subject to the Pope, you are not baptized into the Church : and therefore *Billarmine* sheweth that indirectly we are obliged to the Pope by baptism, which you intend not.

*R.* Come, come, strive not against your knowledge,

1. If our Baptism have not all that is essential, why do you never rebaptize Protestants when they turn to you? Do you not find that you condemn your selves?

2. Why do not you your selves put the name of the Pope into your words of baptism? 3. Doth your Tradition tell you that the ancient Churches did baptize men into a subjection to the Pope?

4. Did any of the Primitive Christians baptize men into the name or subjection of *Peter* or any Apostle? 5. Doth not *Paul* expressly renounce it as to himself and *Peter*, 1 Cor. 1.

12, 13, 14, 15. *Every one of you saith, I am of Paul, and I of Apollo, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ : Is Christ divided? Was Paul Crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul, &c.* 6. Did not Christ himself tell us all that was Essential to baptism in his institution, *Math.* 28 without making any mention of *Peter* or the Pope?

*P.* I cannot deny but our doctrine inferreth that all that are baptized among you have a true Sacrament, but not the Benefit of it, and so are not in a state of pardon and salvation : Or at least when you come to age, by refusing the Pope, you turn Hereticks and lose it.

*R.* I know some of your divided writers say that we have *Sacramentum*, but not *Rem Sacramenti* : But 1. You say that a Character is imprinted by Baptism, and all sin done away, and the person in a state of life, un-

Iels he come *feignedly* ; which you will not charge on Infants, nor can you prove it by those of the Anabaptists themselves that are baptized at age. And saith *Aquinas* when the fiction ceaseth, the fruits of baptism are obtained. 2. And it will be long ere you will prove that to be baptized into the name of the Trinity is uneffectual, if we leave out the Pope. 3. And you will hardly make a man understand what you mean by the validity of the Baptism of Hereticks and Schismaticks, if it neither take the Baptized into the true Visible Church, nor the invisible ( or a state of saving grace ).

And as to Infants losing it as you say at age by Heresie. 1. Will you save all the Anabaptists, that are baptized at age ? If their baptism put them into a state of salvation, and they continue just of the same faith and mind that they were baptized in, sure that faith which put them in a state of salvation, will keep them in it ; or not be damning through defectiveness to morrow, which made them heirs of Heaven to day. But you cannot make your doctrines hang together. 2. And they that are Baptized in Infancy are baptized into the same faith which they continue in at age. The Minister intendeth no other : The Parents, Sponsors, &c. intend no other : And will that prove defective even to Salvation after, which was saving then ? 3. If Baptism make us *Christians* ; and if *Christianity* be the *true Religion*, sufficient *in suo genere* to salvation, then we that continue in the *Christianity* which we were baptized into, by your confession continue in the true *saving Religion* ; And this is *all our Religion*.

P. It is not every one that owneth *Christianity* that shall be saved : Hereticks own it in general, and yet contradict it by their Heresies.

R. It is every one that truly owneth *Christianity* in *mind* and will that shall be saved : else *Christianity* were



were not a saving sufficient Religion : The question is not whether *objective Christianity* or *faith* be sufficient to save him that *believeth not*, or is not *subjectively* a Christian ; nor whether the *doctrine of faith* be sufficient in *omni genere* : But whether it be a *sufficient doctrine*, or *objective faith*, in *suo genere* ? If a *Heretick* deny any essential part of it, he *believeth not* that which he ( really, understandingly and prevalently ) *denyeth*. It is but the *Name of Christianity*, and not the *Thing*, which he owneth, who disowneth any of the *essence*. Our question is now whether our *professed objective Faith* be *true and sufficient* ? When you come to prove us *heretical* denyers of any of its *essence*, we will give you a sufficient answer.

The twelfth Principle. *That the Essence of our Religion or Christianity as Active and Saving, is Faith that worketh by Love : Or such a Belief in God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, as is accompanied with a true devoting of our selves to him, by Love and willingness to obey his Laws, so far as we know them ; in opposition to the temptations of the world, the flesh and the Devil : And he that is truly such shall be saved,*

P. I grant that he that truly Loveth God, shall be saved : But a Protestant cannot truly love God, because he hath not true faith.

R. Do you not agree and confess then, that If any Protestants do truly Love God, and are sincerely willing to obey his will, and to know it that they may obey it, such are of the true Religion and shall be saved, and that popery which denyeth their salvation is false ?

P. If your false supposition were true, these false consequents would be true : But you are all deceived when you think that you sincerely Love God, and are willing to know and do his will.

R. 1. Let all Protestants note this first, that you grant that none but *✠ falſhearted Hypocrites*, that are not what they profess to be, and *Love not God*, nor *would obey him*, should turn Papists.

2. And if a man *cannot know his own Mind and Will*, what he *Loveth* and what he is *willing of*, no not about his *End* and *greatest concernments*, how can he know when he *Believeth aright* ? Why do you trouble the world thus with your noise about Believing the Proposals of your Church, if a man *cannot know whether he believe or not* ? *✠* And he that cannot *know* what he *Willeth*, *Chooseth* or *Loveth*, can no more *know* what he *believeth*. For the *Acts* of the *Will* are more plenary and *easily perceived*. And do all *Papists* *know* their own *Hearts* or *Minds*, but no *Protestants* ? What would you expect but indignation and derision by such arguing as this, if you will go about the world and tell men, [ *You none of you know your own Minds and wills, but we know them ; You think you Love God, and are willing to obey him ; but you are all mistaken, it is not so with you : but you must believe our Pope and his Council, and then you may know your own minds and hearts.* ] They that believe you on these rates, deserve the deceit of believing you ; and punish themselves.

And : But Protestants say, only we know God, and his will.

R. Do you not know, and confess that, that if any Protestant say, we truly Love God, and are willing to obey his will, and know that this is true, they are of the true Religion, and shall be saved, and that popery which denyeth this is false.

The

The thirteenth Principle. *That when Christ described all the Essence of Christianity, by our Believing in and being baptized into, the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, the Apostles and first Pastors of the Churches, instructed people to understand the meaning of these three Articles; And the ancient Creed called the Apostles, is the exposition of them, as to Belief: And that this Creed was of old the symbol of the true faith, by which men were supposed sufficiently qualified for baptism, and distinguished from Hereticks: which after was enlarged by occasion of heresies to the Nicene and Constantinopolitane Creed; To which that called Athanasius's was added as a fuller explication of the doctrine of the Trinity: And he that believed all these, was taken for one of the true Christian Religion, which was sufficient in suo genere to salvation.*

P. All that was then Necessary to be explicitly believed, *necessitate medii*, was expressed in the Creeds (if not more): But not all that is now necessary when the Church hath proposed more.

R. 1. Some of you say, no more is necessary *ut medium*, but to believe that God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him: Others say that the chief articles of the Creed also are commonly necessary: And in your discord we lay no great weight on your Opinions. 2. But is not Christianity the same Thing now as it was at the beginning? Is Baptism altered? Hath not a Christian now the same definition as then? Are not Christs promises and the Conditions the same? Shall not he that was a Christian then, be

saved if he were *now alive* ? May not we be *Christians*, and *saved* by the same *Constitutive Causes* which made men *Christians*, and *saved* them in the *primitive Churches* ? Subvert not *Christianity*, and confound not the *Church*, and cheat not poor souls, by labouring to hide the *essence of Christianity*, and such plain important truths. You cannot deny our faith to be *true*, without condemning the ancient Church and Christianity it self : While we aloud profess that the *Christian faith explained in all the ancient Creeds*, is the faith which we own, in its *Essentials* explicated.

---

The fourteenth Principle. *That the Books which the Protestants commonly receive as Canonical Scriptures, are in the agreeing Original Copies, as to the very words, and in true Translations as to the sence, the most true Infalible word of God.*

---

R. I grant that where the *Copies disagree* by various Readings, we are no more sure that any of them is the word of God, than we are sure, that such a Copy is righter than all that differ from it. But as long as the *essence of Christianity* on which our *Salvation* is laid, is in the *Covenant of Grace*, explained in *Credendis* in the *Creed*, and in *Petendis*, in the *Lords Prayer*, and in *Agendis* in the *Decalogue* as explained by *Christ*. And no one Duty or material doctrine of our Religion dependeth on the *various Lections*, but those texts that *Agree* are sufficient to establish them all; yea, as *Franc. à Sancta Clara system. fid.* professeth, the ordinary *Translations* so agree, as that no material point of Religion doth depend on any of their differences; It is as much as we assert, that the *Agreeing Original Copies*,  
and

and the *sound-Translations*, so far as they are such, are the True Infalible word of God; the *former* both as to words and sence, and the *later* as to sence alone. Do you not grant this?

P. We grant the Scripture as you say to be Gods Infalible word; But 1. You cannot know it to be so, because you take it not on the Roman Churches Authoritative Proposal; 2. And you leave out part of it.

R. 1. Whether we can know it, shall be tryed in due place. 2. And whether we have *All of it*, or *enough*, is another question, to be debated when you will. You grant us expressly that which we now desire; which is the *Infalible Truth* of our *Canonical Scripture*. And this is *All our Religion*, containing not only the *Essentials*, but all the *Integrals*, and *Accidentals* needful to be recorded. So that *All the Protestants Religion is confessed to be Infalibly True*.

And from hence further note, that in all our disputes, you are obliged to be the *defendants*, as to *Truth*: For we deny the *Truth* of much of your Religion, but you deny not the *Truth* of one word of ours: but only the *Plenitude* or *Sufficiency*.

P. The name of a Protestant was never known till *Luthers* time: And the occasion of it was a particular Protestation of the *German Princes*, and not directly a *Protesting* against *Popery*.

R. It is not *Names* but *Religion* which we dispute of. And it is that which each party *Professeth* to be their *Religion*. Therefore you must take our *Profession* or you change the *subject* of the dispute. And we *profess*, that the *Law of Nature* (which no sober man questioneth) and the *Scriptures*, are *All our Religion*. Therefore if you please you shall suppose that the name *Protestant* were not now in the world: It doth not signifie our Religion. But we now use it to signifie our *Protest-*  
ing

ing against Popery, or that we agree in substance, and in rejecting Popery, with those that made that particular Protestation mentioned by you.

Names are oft given from accidents; as *Africanus*, *Germanicus*, *Britannicus*, &c. to several Roman Captains; when yet their Humanity was the same before they were so named.

P. Turks, Socinians, Quakers, &c. Protest against Popery: It seems then they are Protestants too; and your companions.

R. 1. Thus some men study to deceive, by turning from the question to another. Our question I tell you is *Whether the Religion of the Protestants be Infallible?* and not, *Whence is their name?* 2. But by a Protestant we mean only one that taketh the Scripture for the Rule, and Christianity for the Essence of his Religion: Which no one doth that denyeth any essential part of it. If we do so, prove it, and you shall have our answer. How do you judge of any man among your selves that taketh Gods word proposed by your Church for his Religion, and yet mistaketh the Church in any point: As *Durandus* that thought the matter of Bread continues, whom *Bellarmino* yet denyeth to be an Heretick. So is it with any among us that mistake the sense of Scripture in some such point.

When a Name is put upon any person or party from a common accident, you may if you will call all by that name which that accident agreeth to: And so Papists are called by some *Non-conformists* now in England, because they Conform not: But the world knoweth well enough that it is Protestants which are commonly meant by that name, and not Papists, Quakers, Seekers, &c. though these conform not. And so you may say if it please your self that Turks, Jews, Heathens, Socinians, Quakers, Ranters, are Protestants, because they Protest against,

against, or reject Popery : But the world knoweth who is meant by the Name, Even *Christians rejecting proper Popery.*

And for my part, I deal openly with you, I care not if the name *Protestant* were utterly cast aside ; If any man be so deceived by it as 1. Either to think that it signifieth the *Essence* of our Religion ( unless you mean as we *Protest* for Christianity. ) 2. Or that we take those called *Protestants* for the *whole Catholick Church*, they make it an occasion of their own deceit : Names of distinction are used, because men know not else readily how to speak intelligibly of one another without circumlocutions : And then cometh the *Sectarian*, and taketh his *Party*, for *all the Church* ( at least which he may lawfully Communicate with ), and the *name* of his party to notifie *his Religion*. And then comes the *crafty Papist*, and pretends from hence that such a *named Religion* is new ; and asketh you, *where was there any ( e. g. ) Protestants before Luther ?*

My Religion is *naked Christianity*, the same as is where the name of a *Protestant* is *not known*, and as was *before it was known* ; and as if the name of the *Pope* had never been known. But now the *Pope* and his *Monarchical Usurpation* over all the world, are *risen and known*, I am one of those that protest against them, as being against Christianity which is my Religion ; But so as to addict my self to the opinions of no man or party that opposeth them, wholly and absolutely and beyond evidence of truth : I take the *Reformed Churches*, to be the *soundest* in the world : But I take their Confessions to be all the *Imperfect expressions* of men ; and the *Writings* of Protestant Divines to be some more clear and sound, and some more dark, empty, and less sound, and in many things I differ from many of them. Choose now whether you will call me a *Protestant* or not ; I tell



tell you *my Religion* , which is *simple Christianity* : Names are at your own Will. I could almost wish that there were no name known besides that of CHRISTIAN as notifying our *faith* and *Religion*, in the Christian world ( Though as notifying *Heressie* and *sin*, there must be proper names , as in *Rev.* the name *Nicolaitans* is used ). Even the word *Catholick* had long a narrower sense in the Empire with many than I now own it in. Though as it signifieth *One that is of the Church Universal*, loveth *Universally* all true *Christians*, and hath Communion with them in Faith, Love, and Hope, so I like it, and am A CATHOLICK CHRISTIAN. I dispute for nothing else ; I perswade this person here in Doubt, to nothing else ; but 1. To hold fast to true and meer Christianity ; 2. To *Reject* all in Popery or any other Sect that is *Evidently against it* ; 3. To *suspend* his belief of all *thats doubtful*, and to receive nothing as a part of *Divine faith* or *Religion*, till he be *sure* that indeed it is of God.

And now these Principles being supposed, let us proceed, and try whether Popery be of God or not.

## PART III.

*The Protestants Reasons against Popery.*

D. **I** Have heard what you have said in stating the *Protestants Religion*: I now expect to hear *what Reasons you have against that which you call Popery*: And afterwards that you prove all that you charge upon it. But I adjure you first that you say nothing but what you believe in your conscience to be the truth, as one that looketh to be judged for it.

R. With many Papists confident and vehement protestations go instead of Arguments, and we oft hear them say, [ *If this be not true, I am content to be torn in a thousand pieces: We will seal it with our blood: We will lay our salvation on it: And do you think we have not souls to save? &c.* ] Which is much like as if they would end all Controversies by *laying Wagers* that they are in the right, or by *protesting* that they are *honester and credibler men* than their adversaries: And it is no more than a Quaker or other such Sectary will say: the most proud and ignorant being usually the most confident: But yet though I expect not that you should receive any thing from me, upon *Protestations*, but upon *Proofs*, I will here promise you that I will charge nothing on the Papists, but what in my Conscience I am verily perswaded to be true.

The

The Reasons which resolve me against *Popery* are these and such like.

I. *Reason*, Their Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* is so notoriously false and inhumane, even contrary to the fullest ascertaining evidence that mankind can expect on earth, (*viz.* for all men on pain of damnation to believe, that there is *no Bread*, and *no Wine*, when all the soundest senses of any men in the world, do perceive Bread and Wine, by seeing it, tasting it, feeling it, smelling it, and by the notorious effects; and all this built upon *no Revelation of God*, *no Reason at all*, nor any true consent of the *Primitive Church*, but *clearly contrary to them all*;) that I solemnly profess, that I find it an utter *Impossibility* to believe it: And it often puts me to a doubt, Whether it be possible for any mortal man unfeignedly and fully to believe it, and Whether there be really any such *Papist in the world*: or Whether most do not for carnal respects take on them to believe it, when they do not; or rather the *Vulgar* understand their words, as not really excluding the true being of *Bread and Wine*; and the rest only somewhat overawing their own reason with a reverence of their Church, so far as not to contradict, or so far as notionally to own it, when they do not from the heart believe the thing.

So many contradictions, absurdities, and impieties are to be by them believed with it, that I am sure no man that understandeth them, can possibly believe them all.

And all this must be done by *Miracles*, stupendious miracles, daily or common miracles, which every Priest can do at his pleasure, and never fail, sober or drunken, greater than raising a man from the dead; so that

that every beastly, sordid, ignorant Priest, shall do more miracles by far, than ever Jesus Christ did in all his life on earth, as far as we know by the holy Records, (if he live as long). He that can believe all this, may next believe, that there is neither Earth under his feet, nor the Firmament over his head, nor Water, nor Air, nor any other Creature, and that he hath no *being* himself.

---

I I. *Reason*: The Faith or Religion of the Papists, as described by themselves, is so far from Infallibility, as that it is utterly uncertain, unintelligible, and meer contradiction and confusion; and a changeable thing; so that no man knoweth whether he have it or not, and whether he have it all. But whoever hath it, he hath certainly a hodge-podge of truth and falsehood.

---

I I I. *Reason*. Their Papacy, which essentiateth their Church, is a horrid Usurpation of Christs own Prerogative, and of an Office to do that which is incomparably above the Natural Power or Capacity of any mortal man; even to be the Apostle and Governour of the whole world (of Christians at least); To take Charge of all the souls on earth; to teach and call those that are uncalled, and to Rule those that are baptized: even at the Antipodes, and in all those unknown or inaccessible parts of the world, which he hath no knowledge of: A far more arrogant undertaking, than to be the Civil Monarch of all the earth; and utterly impossible for him to perform, and which never was performed by him.

I V. *Reason.* The said Papacy is an arrogant Usurpation of the Power of all the Christian Princes and Pastors upon earth, or of a Power over them, never given by Christ : It setteth up a Kingdom in a Kingdom, and taketh from Pastors the power which Christ gave them, over their particular flocks.

V. *Reason.* The said Papacy is a meer humane Institution : They confess themselves , that it is not of Divine faith that the Bishop of Rome is *S. Peters* Successor by Divine Right : It is no article of their *own faith* : But History fully assureth us, that it was but in the *Roman Empire*, that the *Roman Bishop* was made Supream : as the Archbishop of *Canterbury* is in *England* : And that he standeth on the same humane foundation as the *other four Patriarchs* of the Empire did. And that their *General Councils* were called by the *Emperours*, and were called *General* only with respect to that Empire. And there never was such a thing as a *General Council* of all the *Christian world*, nor ever can be : And that there never was such, is most notorious yet by the Names subscribed to all the Councils. But they abuse the world, and claim that power over all the *Christians on earth*, which one Prince gave his subject-Prelates in his Empire : As if the *General Assembly* of Scotland or France should pretend to be a *General Council* of the world, and the Archbishop of *Canterbury* should call himself Archbishop of all the Church on earth, and claim the government of it.

*V I. Reason:* The said Papacy hold their claim of *Supream Government* as by *Gods appointment* ( though they confels as before said, that it is not *de fide*, that the Pope succeedeth *Peter* by Divine right ) and this notoriously *Contrary to the Judgement and Tradition of the far greatest part of the Churches in the world:* General Councils ( such as they had ) and the sense of the greatest part of Christians have determined against the Papal claime. And *Tradition* condemneth them to this day, while they plead *Tradition*.

*V I I. Reason:* It is Treason against Christ for the Papists who are but a *Sett*, and not the third part of the Christians in the world, to call themselves the *whole Church*, and unchurch all the rest, and seek to rob Christ of the far greatest part of his Kingdom, by denying them to be such: As if they would deny two third parts of this Kingdom to be the Kings. They are Sectaries and Schismaticks by this arrogant dividing from all the rest, and appropriating the name and privileges of the Church to themselves alone.

*V I I I. Reason:* By making an *unlawful* and *Impossible Condition* and Center of *Church Union*, they are the *greatest Schismaticks* in all the world: The greatest *Dividers* of the Church upon pretence of *Unity*: As he would be a divider of this Kingdom, who would set up a *Vice-King* without the Kings authority, and say that none that subject not themselves to him, shall be taken for subjects of the King.

*IX. Reason:* They studiously brand themselves with Satans mark of malice, or uncharitableness and cruelty to mens souls: while they sentence to damnation two third parts of the Christian world, because they will not be the subjects of their Pope: And they think their way to Heaven is safest, because they are bolder than us in damning other Christians: Whereas *Love* is the mark by which Christs Disciples must be known to all.

*X. Reason:* They are inhumanely cruel to mens bodies: And this is their very Religion: For the Council at the *Laterane* under *Innocent* the third decreed, that those that believe not, or deny Transubstantiation are Hereticks, and all Temporal Lords shall exterminate them from their Dominions: That is, no man shall be suffered to live under any Christian Lord, that will not renounce all his senses, and profess that he believeth that they are all deceived by God himself, which is not only to renounce their *Humanity*, but their *Animality* or sense it self. So that *no men indeed*, are to be suffered to live, but only such as *deny themselves to be men*: What Heathens, what Turks, did ever exercise such Inhumane fury? Besides their burning and tormenting men as Hereticks that will not do all this and more, and will not say as they require them.

*XI. Reason:* Their Church *indeed* is *invisible*, while they deny it, and an unknown thing: For, 1. Men are forced into it by such bloody Laws, as that they cannot rationally be known to be *Consenters*:

2. And



2. And they have no certain faith to conscience  
Church-member: For they hold that his obligation to  
believe, is according to his inward and outward means,  
of which no man can possibly judge: And so no man  
can know whether himself or another have that faith  
which is required as necessary to salvation: And many  
of them say, That they that believe not in Christ, have  
saving faith, and are in the Church, if they had not  
sufficient means.

Turk may make a Pope

XII. Reason: The Papacy doth intolerably tyrannize over Kings, and teach such Doctrines of Perjury and Rebellion, as their very Religion, as is not in the practice of it to be endured in any Kingdom, nor dare they fully practise it: The Crowns and Lives of Princes being at the mercy of the Pope: As the said Laterane Council sheweth.

XIII. Reason: Their Church is oft Essentially unholily, heretical and wicked, because the Pope is often so, who is an Essential part of it: And therefore is not the holy Catholick Church. General Councils have upon examination judged their Popes to be Hereticks, Schismaticks, Adulterers, Murderers, Simonists, yea, guilty of Blasphemy or Infidelity it self. And the Church cannot be Holy, whose Essential part is to unholily.

XIV. Reason: Their Churches succession is so notoriously interrupted, and their Papacy so often altered in its causes, as that it is become a confounded and a meer uncertain thing. So many notorious or judged

Hereticks, Simonists, Murderers, Sodomites, Adulterers have possessed the Seat, who were therefore *incapable*, that the line of succession must needs be interrupted by them. And so many wayes have they been made for elected, sometimes by the people, sometimes by the City-Presbyters, sometimes by Emperours, sometimes by Cardinals, sometimes by Councils, that if any *one way of Election* be necessary, they have lost their Papacy long ago. If *no one way* be necessary, then the Turk may make a Pope.

---

XV. Reason: Their Church called *One*, is really *two in specie*; one Headed by a Pope, and another by a *General Council*: For while the *Head* or *Supream Ruler* is an *Essential part*, and *one part* of the people own *one Head* and another part own *another Head*, (as they do) the Churches thus constituted cannot be *One*.

And also *de individuo* there have been long two or three Popes at once; and consequently two or three Churches: And to this day none knoweth which was the right.

---

XVI. Reason: They plead for a Church which never had a being in the world; that is, *All Christians Headed by one Pope*: When *all the Christian world* did never take him for their Head, nor were governed by him to this day.

---

XVII. Reason: They dreadfully injure the *holy Scriptures*, as if *Jesus Christ*, and all the *Prophets* and *Apostles* in all those Sacred Records, had not had *skill*

or

or will to speak intelligibly, and plainly to deliver us the doctrines necessary to salvation : But they make their *Voluminous Councils* more intelligible and sufficient ; as if they had done better than Christ and his Apostles : And when men must only *Discern Gods Laws*, and *Judge Causes by the Law*, they make themselves *Judges of the Law it self*, that is, of God the Judge of all, and of that Law by which they must be judged.

---

XVIII. *Reason* : There is no other Sect of Christians under Heaven which hath so many differences among themselves, or have written so many Books against one another as the Papists : And though many of them are of great importance, yea, some are about the very Essence or Constitutive Head of their Church, yet have they no handsomer way to palliate all by, than by saying that these are but *Opinions*, and no *Articles of faith*, and the Infallible Judge dare not decide them : No though it be diversity of *Expositions of Gods own Word*, yet Commentators still differ without any hope of a decision, as if *Gods Word* were not to be believed, but were only the matter of *uncertain Opinion*, till the Pope and Council have expounded it, and no more Scripture is *de fide* than they expound.

---

XIX. *Reason* : Perjury is made the very Character of their Church, or the brand by which it is stigmatized ; As is visible 1. In the *Trent Oath* imposed on their Clergy, which whoever taketh he is immediately perjured : and 2. By their disobliging men from Oaths and Vows ; even the Subjects of Princes from their *Oaths of Allegiance* ; whenever the Pope shall excom-

municate them, and give their Dominions to others, as is decreed *Concil. Later. sub Innoc. 3. Can. 3.*

*XX. Reason:* They are guilty of *Idolatri* in their ordinary Worship by the Mass: while they worship *Bread* as their Lord God: Nor will it justify them to say, that if they thought it to be *Bread*, they would not worship it: Any more than it would justify *Julian* to say, that he would not worship the *Sun*, if he thought not that it was *God*: And they confess, that if it prove to be still *Bread*, their Worship will prove *Idolatri*: and we desire no other proof,

And I am not able to justify their sending God his Worship by a *Gross*, *Crucifix*, or other *Image*, as a *medium culum*, from being a gross Violation of the second Commandment: (which they leave out).

*XXI. Reason:* Their Religion greatly tendeth to *Mortifie Christianity*, and turn it into a *dead Image*, by destroying much of its life and power: 1. By befriending *Ignorance*, and hiding the *holy Scripture*, forbidding all the people to read them in a known tongue without a special license: blaspheming Gods Word, as if so read, it had more tendency or likelihood to hurt men than to profit them, to damn them than to save them; when they will say otherwise of all their own *Vulgar* postils and such like writings.

2. And by teaching the people a *blind devotion*, viz. to pray in an *unknown tongue*, and to worship God by words not understood.

3. And by making up a Religion much, if not far most, of *external formalities*, and a multitude of *ceremonies*, and the *opus operatum* of their various *Sacraments*;

ments; As if God delighted in such actions as besit not the acceptance of a grave and sober man; or as if *Guilt* and *Sin* would be wiped off, and charmed away into virtue and holiness, by such corporeal motions, shews and words.

XXII. *Reason*: Their Religion, though it thus tend to gratifie the *ungodly* by deceitful remedies and hopes, yet is very *uncomfortable* to the godly. For, 1. By it no man can know that he is a *true believer*, and not a child of Hell, (much less that he shall be saved: ) For they teach that no Divine can tell them what Articles are necessary to be believed to salvation: But they must be so many as are suited to every *ones* capacity, and means, during his life. And no man living can know that he understandeth and believeth as much as his capacity and means were in their kind sufficient to: Nay, there is no man that hath not been culpably ignorant of somewhat which he might have known.

2. Mens Sacramental receptions and comforts depend on the *Intention* of the *Priest*, which no man knoweth.

3. Almost all Godly men must expect the *fire of Purgatory*: and consequently none of them can be *rationally willing to dye*: Because *this life* is better than *Purgatory*; and no man will desire to go from hence into the fire: And so by making *all men unwilling to dye*, it destroyeth a *heavenly mind*, and killeth *faith*, and *hope*, and *love*, and *holy joy*, and tempteth men to be *worldlings*, and to love this life better than the next. Yea, it tempteth men to be afraid of *Martyrdom*, lest (dying in *Venial sins*, as all do) they go to a *Purgatory fire*, more terrible than *Martyrdom*.

---

**XXIII. Reason:** Their Doctrine is not only contrary to many expresse Texts of Holy Scripture, but also contrary to it self: One Pope and one Council having decreed one thing, and another the clean contrary.

---

**XXIV. Reason:** All this evil is made more pernicious, by that professed Impenitence which is included in the conceit of their Churches Infallibility: For they that hold themselves Infallible, do profess never to Repent, of any thing in which they suppose themselves to be so. And as Repentance is the great evidence of the pardon of sin; so *Impenitency* is that mortal sign of an unpardoned soul, without which no sin doth qualifie the sinner to be Excommunicated by man, or damned by God: And a sin *materially less, is more Mortal unrepented of*, than a greater truly lamented and forsaken.

---

**XXV. Reason:** Every honest godly Protestant may be as sure that Popery is false, as he is that he is himself sincere, and Loveth God, and is truly willing to obey him. And no man can turn Papist, without self-contradiction, who is a true Christian, and an honest man: For by turning Papist he confesseth himself to be before a false-hearted hypocrite, who neither Loved God, nor sincerely desired to obey him, nor was true to his Baptismal Covenant. For it is a part of Popery to believe that none are in a state of salvation, but the *Subjects of the Pope*, or members of the Papal Church; And consequently that no others have true Faith, Repentance

penitance or Love to God: Or else that God is false in promising salvation, to all that have true Faith, Repentance and Love to God. All therefore that know their own hearts to be truly devoted to God, are safe from Popery; And seeing it is agreed on both sides, that none can or ought to turn Papists but *ungodly hypocrites* (or Knaves) no wonder if such are deluded by the most palpable deceits, and forsaken of God whom they perfidiously forsook.

---

I will name you no more: If I make these, or any one of these good (as I undertake to prove them all), you will see that I refuse not my self to be a Papist without sufficient cause.

And yet by this charge you will see that I am none of their extream adversaries: I pass by abundance of Doctrinal differences, wherein by many they are most deeply charged: Not as *Justifying them* against all or most so charged on them, but 1. As giving you those Reasons which most *move my self*, and which I am most able to make good, and leaving every one to his proper work: 2. And as one that have *certainly found out*, that in *many doctrinals* seeming to be the matter of our widest difference, we are thought by many to differ much more than we do; 1. The difference lying most in *Words*, and *Logical Notions*, and various wayes of mens expressing their conceptions: 2. And the animosity of men engaged in *Parties* and *Interests* against each other, causing most to take all in the worst sense, and to make each other seem far more erroneous than they are, and to turn *differing names* into *damnable heresies*: And 3. Few men having *Will* and *Skill* to state controversies aright, and cut off mistaken seeming differences: 4. And few having *honesty* and *self-denial* enough



enough to incur the censure of the ignorant Zealots of their own party, by seeming but impartial and just to their adversaries.

I mean in such points, as 1. The Nature of Divine faith, Whether it be a perswasion that I am pardoned, &c. 2. Of Certainty of salvation, 3. And Certainty of perseverance, 4. Of Sanctification, 5. Of Justification, 6. Of Good works, 7. Of Merit, 8. Of Predestination, 9. Of Providence and the Cause of Sin: 10. Of Free-will, 11. Of Grace, 12. Of Imputation of Righteousness, 13. Of Universal Redemption, 14. Of Original Sin, and divers others: In all which I cannot justify them, but am sure that the difference is made commonly to seem to be that which indeed it is not: In the true impartial stating whereof *Lud. Le Blanck* hath begun to do the Christian Churches most excellent service, worthy our great thanks, and his bearing all the Censures of the ignorant.

---

PART

## PART IV.

**The First Charge made good against Transubstantiation:** In which Popery is proved to be the Shame of Humane Nature, Contrary to SENSE, REASON, SCRIPTURE and TRADITION, or the judgement of the Antient and Present Church; devised by Satan to expose Christianity to the Scorn of Infidels.

---

## CHAP. I.

*The First Reason to prove Transubstantiation false.*

R. **T**He Papists Belief of Transubstantiation is, that There is a change made of the whole substance of the Bread into the body of Christ, and of the whole substance of Wine into his blood. Their opinion (called their faith) hath two parts: The first is, that There is no more true Proper Bread and Wine after the words of Consecration, *Hoc est Corpus meum*. The second is, that There is the true proper Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ, under the species (as they call them) of Bread and Wine,

It

It is the first that I shall now prove false: And you must not forget the state of the Question, which is not, *Whether Christs Body and Blood be present? But Whether there remain any Bread and Wine?*

Aquin. p. 3. q. 73. a. 3. ad 3. *Fides non est contra sensum, sed est de eo ad quod sensus non attingit.* But doth not sense say, Here is Bread and Wine?

*Arg. I.* If there remain *no Bread and Wine* after the Consecration, then all the senses of all the sound men in the world are deceived, or all mens perception of these sensible things deceived, though there be due magnitude, site, distance of the object, a due abode, and a due medium and no depravation of the sense or intellect. But this Consequent is notoriously false, (as shall be proved) Therefore Popery is false.

1. That all mens senses perceive *Bread and Wine*, or all mens Intellects by their senses, will not be denyed. Not only Protestants, but Greeks, Mahometans, Heathens, Papists, all persons perception by sense is here the same: Therefore it is *sound senses* or else there are none sound in the world.

2. It is not *one sense*, but all. The eye seeth Bread and Wine: The hand and mouth feel it; The palate tasteth it; The smelling sense smelleth the Wine; yea, and the ear heareth it poured out.

3. It is in due quantity, and not an undiscernable Atom.

4. It is near the sense, and neither by too much distance or nearness made insensible.

5. It hath a due abode, and is not made insensible by hasty passing by.

6. The air, and light, and all necessary media of perception are present. So that there is nothing wanting to the sensibility of the object.

P. And

P. And how do you prove all or any of these? For ought you know, the *media* may be *undue*, the magnitude, site, distance, abode, may not be what they seem to be; and so you prove not what you say.

R. All that I am now saying, is, that *All men of sound sense, in the world have these immediate clear perceptions*: The *Intellect* by *sense* perceiveth the object as *quantitative*, as *near*, &c. This you dare not deny: So that if this perception be false, and here be no Bread and Wine, then *Sense* or the *Intellect* discerning by the means of *sense*, is deceived.

P. I say that the *Senses* or *Intellects* perception are deceived.

R. I prove that they are not deceived, or at least, that this *kind of perception* is the *most certain* that man on earth is capable of, and is to be *trusted to by all men*, and *disbelieved or contradicted by none*.

*Reason I.* Because that *humane nature* is so formed, that the *Intellect* hath no other way of *perceiving things sensible*, but as they are first perceived by the *sense*, and by it transmitted to the *Intellect* (or made its objects): And if about *Spirits* it hold not, that *There is nothing in the Intellect, which was not first in the sense*: yet about *things sensible*, it doth undenyably hold: And also that the *Intellect of it self* is not free to perceive things sensible otherwise than as they are *sensed*, or nor to perceive them; but is *naturally necessitated* to perceive them. So that it is a contradiction for a man to be a man, consisting of a *reasonable soul*, with *sensitive faculties* and a body, and yet not to be formed to judge of *things sensible as sense perceiveth them*.

P. Then mad men cease to be men, if they judge otherwise.

R. Mad men are your fittest presidents: But, 1. I told you how mans nature is made by God to judge of things:

things: I told you not that this nature may not be *vi-*  
*olated*, and *hindered* from right action. Did I ever  
 say, that the eye may not be *blinded*, or the understand-  
 ing distracted? Blind men and mad men judge not ac-  
 cording to the tendency of *Nature*, and therefore *mis-*  
*judge*. The Connexion of the Intellect to the sense is  
 essential to man as man; but so is not the *founderess* or  
 right exercise of his faculties.

*Reason I I.* Hence I argue, that *sensation* and the  
*understandings perception thereby*, is the *first perception*  
 of mans soul, and all that follow are but the *rational*  
*improvements of it*, and therefore ever *presuppose* it:  
 The natural order of the souls apprehensions is this,  
 beyond all controverſie. First *Sense* perceiveth things  
*sensible*, and the *Imagination* the *Images* of them.  
 Next the *Understanding* by a *simple perception* conceiv-  
 eth of them as it findeth them in the *imagination*.  
 Thirdly, then by this *Thinking* or *Knowing*, we per-  
 ceive also our *own Act*, that we do so *Think* or *Know*.  
 And then Fourthly, We *compound* our *conceptions*, and  
 form *organical notions*, and spin out *conclusions* from  
 what we first perceive. Now if the *first perceptions*  
 be *uncertain* or *false*, it must needs follow, that all  
 those following *thoughts*, and *reasonings* which do but  
 improve them, are at least as *uncertain* and *false*, if  
 not more. So that there can be no more certainty in  
 any of the *Conclusions* as such; than there is in the  
*premises* and *principles*. Therefore if mans *first* and  
*most natural necessary* perceptions are *false*, all the  
 following actions or reasonings of his mind must be no  
 better. All being finally resolved into these *perceptions*  
 by *sense*, there is no Truth or Certainty in mans mind  
 at all, if there be none in these.

*Reason I I I.*

*Reason III.* Else you would infer, that *God is not at all to be Believed*, and that there is no such thing as *Divine Faith and Religion in Certainty* in the world; And so you would bring in, by unavoidable consequence, far worse *Impiety*, and *Irreligion* than *Mahomet* or *Julian*, or any *Idolaters* that I hear of on the earth. For you directly will overthrow the *Divine Veracity*, or *Truth of Gods Revelations*, which is the *Formal Object of Faith*, without which, it is no *Faith*.

P. A heavy charge, if you can make it good.

R. To make it good, do but first observe, 1. That *Gods Essential Will* or *mind* is not *in* *it self* immediately seen by man; but known only by some *Revelation*.

2. That this *Revelation* is nothing but some *SIGNES*: For there is nothing in the *Universe of Beings*, but *GOD* and *CREATURES* and the *ACTS* or *Works* of *Creatures*. Now it is not *Gods own Essence* which is the *Revelation* in question. Therefore it must be either *A Creature* (or work of *God*), or an *Act* or *Work* of a *Creature*. As the *voice* on *Mount Sinai*, and that of *Christ* at his baptism and transfiguration, and the written *Tables of Stone*, &c. were either the *works* of *God* immediately, and so created *Signs* of his mind; or else the *Acts* of *Angels*, and so *Imperate Signs* of his mind. Nor it is not the *ordinariness* or *extraordinariness* of the way of making these signs, which maketh them *curreant* and *true*, or *credible*: For if *God* can make a *Natural false sign*, he can make a *supernatural false* one, for ought any mortal man can prove. Only all the question is, Whether it be indeed a *sign* of the *mind* and *will* of *God* or not? Now the *works* of *Nature* are *Gods Natural Signs*, and his *Natural objective Light* and *Law*; as the perception of them is the *Subjective*

*jective or Active Light and Law of Nature: Something of God, these Natural signs do signifie or reveal plainly, and some things darkly: And so it is with supernatural signs; As the written Tables, the voice of an Angel, the words of an inspired Prophet or Apostle, &c.* Now there is no other way for God to speak or reveal falsely, could he do it, but 1. Either to make a false sign, naturally or supernaturally, or 2. To determine mans sense or mind to a false perception. And if God can do this naturally, why not supernaturally?

Nay, *a fortiori* mark how you teach the Infidel to infer? 1. Gods Natural Revelations are Common, and his supernatural rare. 2. Gods Natural Revelations are most certainly his own Acts: But how far a Voice or Book from a Spirit, may be the Act of that Spirit or Angel as a free Agent, and how far that Agent is fallible or defectible, we could not tell, if we had not farther Evidence of Gods owning it. Therefore if you make Gods own ordinary Natural Revelations or significations to be false, how will you be able to disprove the Infidel about the rest? 3. And then note, that our Case is yet lower and plainer than all this: For if the very Being of the Creatures, which is the Matter of these Signs be uncertain to us, and all our senses and minds deceived about it, then we have no place for enquiry, Whether this Creature be any sign of the mind of God. As if the hearing of all men was deceived, that thought they heard that voice, [ *This is my Beloved Son* ] or Pauls, that thought he heard Christ speak to him [ *Saul, Saul, &c.* ] or if their Eyes and Intellects were deceived, that thought they saw Christ and his miracles; or that think now that they read the Bible, and indeed there be no such thing as a Bible, no such words, &c. then there is no room to enquire what they



they signify: For *nothing* hath *no* signification. *Truth* and *Goodness* are *affections* or *modes* of *Being*: And if we cannot by all our *sound senses* know the *Being* of *things*, we can much less know that they are *True* or *Good*. Therefore all knowledge, and all faith, and all Religion is overthrown by your denial of the truth of our Senses and Intellects perception of things sensible.

*Reason IV.* And by this means you are not *capable* of being *disputed* with, nor any Controversie between you and any others in the world, of being decided, while you deny sense. For then you agree not with mankind in *any one common principle*. And they that agree in nothing, can dispute of nothing. For this is the first principle: *Est vel non est* is first to be agreed on, before we can dispute any farther of a *substance*. What will you do to confute an adversary, but drive him to deny a certain principle? And can you drive him to deny a *lower fundamental* Principle, than the *Being* of a *substance* perceived by sense, yea, by *all the sound senses* of *all men* in the world?

*Reason V.* Yea, it is specially to be noted, that our difference is not only about the *species* of a sensible substance, but about the very *substance* it self in *genere*, Whether all our senses perceive *any substance* at all, or not. Suppose the question were, Whether it be *water* or not, which all mens senses see in Rivers? If a Papist would deny it to be *water*, doubtless he denyed the agreeing judgement of all mens Intellect by sense. But if he should also say, *It is no substance*, which we call *water* or *earth*, This were to deny the *first Principle*, and most fundamental perception in nature.

Now that *this* is *your case*, is undeniable. For,  
1. You profess, that *Christi Body* and *Blood* are not *sensible* there; That it is not the *quantity*, *shape*, *number*,

ber, colour, smell, weight, &c. of Christ's Body and Blood which we perceive, and that these Accidents are not the Accidents of Christ. 2. And you believe that the Bread and Wine is gone, that is, changed into the body and blood of Christ; so that no part of *their* substance, matter or form is left. And you put no *third* substance under these Accidents in the stead. So that you maintain, that it is the quantity of nothing, the figure of nothing, the colour, the weight, the situation, the smell, the number, &c. of nothing, which all mens Intellects by sense perceive. So that the Controversie is, *Whether it be any substance at all which by those accidents we perceive?* And when we see, handle, taste, smell it, you believe (or say you believe) that it is none; neither Bread or Wine, or any other: Now if by sense we cannot be sure of the very Being of a substance, we can be sure of nothing in the world.

*Reason V I.* Yea, it is to be noted, that though Brutes have no Intellects, yet their Sense and Imagination herein wholly agreeth with the common perception of man: A Dog or a Mouse will eat the bread as common bread, and a Swine will drink the Wine as common Wine: and therefore have the same perception of it as of common bread and wine; And so their senses must be all deceived as well as mans. And Brutes have as accurate perfect senses as men have, and some much more. And meer natural operations are more certain and constant (as we see by the worlds experience) than meer Reason and Argumentation. Birds and Beasts are constant in their perceptions and course of action, being not left to the power of *Mutable* free-will.

*Reason V I I.* You hereby quite overthrow your own foundation, which is fetcht from the Concord of all your party, which you call all the Church: You think that

that a *General Council* could not agree to anything as an Article of faith if it were not such; (when it is but the *Major Vote* that agree); You say that *Tradition* is *Infallible*, because *All the Church agree* in it, (when it is perhaps but *your Sect*, which is a *Minor part*). But do you not overthrow all this, when you profess, that *All the senses of all the sound men in the world*, and all the *simple perceptions of their Intellects by sense*, do agree, that there is *substance*, yea, *de specie Bread and Wine* after the Consecration? No one man's perception by sense disagreed in this, from the institution of the Sacrament to this day, that can be proved, or the least probability of it given. And if *this Concord* be no proof, much less is *yours*: For,

1. The Intellect in Reasoning is more fallible than in its *Immediate perception of things sensed* (or perceived by sense).
2. *Yours* is but the Consent of *some men*; but *ours* is the Consent of *all mankind*. *Yours* among your selves hath oft in Councils a *Minor part of dissenters*, who must be overvoted by the rest: But our *Cause* hath never one dissenting sense or perception.

*Reason VIII.* By this denial of sense, you overthrow the foundations of *Humane Converse*: How can men make any *sure Contracts*, or perform any duty on a *sure ground*, if the *Concordant senses* of all the world be false? Parents cannot be sure which are their own Children; nor Children which are their own Parents: Husbands cannot certainly know their own Wives from their neighbours. No Subjects can certainly know their own Prince. No man can be sure, whether he buy or sell, receive money or pay it, &c. No man can be sure that there is a Pope, or Priest, or man in the world.

*Reason IX.* You seem to me to *Blaspheme God*, and to make him the *greatest Deceiver of mankind*, even

in his *holy Worship* : Whereas *God cannot lye* ; It is *impossible* : And the *Devil is the Father of lyes* : And you make *God* to tell all the world ( as plainly as if words told them ) even by *demonstration* to their sight, smell, feeling, taste, that, *here is Bread and Wine*, when there is none ; yea, that it is at least some *substance* which they perceive, when it is none at all.

*Reason X.* You thus fain *God* to be *Cruel to Mankind*, and that under *pretence of Grace* ; Even to put such *hard Conditions of salvation* on man, which seem to us *impossible*, to any but *mad men*, or those who by *faction* have cast their minds into a dream. If these be *Gods Conditions*, that no man shall be *saved*, that doth not believe that all his senses, and all the senses of all the world, are deceived when they perceive *Bread and Wine*, or *substance*, many may take on them to believe it, but few will believe it ; and be saved indeed.

*Reason XI.* Hereby you make the *Gospel* or *New Covenant* to be far harder and more rigorous than either the *Law of Moses*, or the *Law of Innocency* : For neither of these did damn men for believing the *agreeing senses of all mankind* : *Perfect Obedience*, to a perfect nature, was fit to be a delight. The burdensome *Ceremonies* had no such *Impossibilities* in them. None of them obliged men to renounce *all their senses*, and to come to Heaven by so hard a way.

*Reason XII.* You seem to me to *Contradict Gods Law and terms of life*, and to forge the clean contrary as his : He saith, *He that cometh to God must Believe that God is, &c.* and *He that believeth shall be saved*, and *he that believeth not shall be damned* : But you seem to me to say in plain effect, [ *He that Believeth Gods Natural Revelations to all mens senses shall be damned*, and that *believeth that the said Revelations are false, may be saved, cæteris paribus.* ]

*Reason*

*Reas. XIII.* And what a thing by this do you make *Gods Grace* to be ? Whereas true *Grace* is the *Repairer* and *perfecter* of *Nature*, you make it to be the *destroyer* and *deceiver* of *Nature*. The use of *Grace* according to your faith is to cause men to believe that *Gods natural Revelations are false*, and that all the senses of the world in this matter are deceived : Whereas a *mad man* can believe this *without Grace*.

*Reas. XIV.* By this doctrine you abominably corrupt the Church with *hypocrisie*, while all that will have Communion with you, must be forced to profess that all mens senses are thus deceived : And can you think that *really they can all believe it* ? or rather your Church must be mostly made up of *gross hypocrites* who falsely take on them to believe it when they do not.

*Reas. XV.* And by this means you make the *Unity* of the Church to become a *meer Impossibility* : For your condition of union is, that *men all believe this among other Articles of your faith* : And that man hath lost or vitiated his humanity who can believe and expect, that *all Christians in the world should ever believe that all the senses of all the world are thus deceived*. You might as well say, The Church shall never have Unity till all Christians do believe that *David or Christ was a Worm* and no *man*, a *door*, a *Vine*, a *thief*, a *Rock*, in proper sense ; or we shall have no unity till we renounce both our *humanity* and *animality* and the *light and Law* of *God in Nature*. And after this to cry up *Uniry*, and cry down *Schism*, what *abominable hypocrisie* is it ?

*Reas. XVI.* And by this doctrine what *bloody inhumanity* is become the brand or Character of your Church ? When you decree *Concil. Later. sub. Innoc. 3. Can. 3.* that all that will not thus renounce their senses, and give the lie to *Gods natural revelations*, shall be *excommunicated* and *utterly undone* in this World,

even banished from all that they have, and from the Land of their Nativity ; Yea your Inquisition must torture and burn them, and your Writ *de hereticis comburendis* must be issued out against them, to fry them to death in flames, if they will not renounce the common senses of mankind.

*Reas. XVII.* And it even amazeth me to think what horrid Tyrants you would thus make all Christian Princes. When the said Canon determineth that they shall be first *Excommunicate* and then cast out of their *Dominions*, which shall be given to others, and their subjects absolved from their allegiance and fidelity, except they will exterminate all these as hereticks from their Dominions, who will not give the lye to all mens senses and to Gods natural Revelations. The plain English is, *He shall not be the Lord of his own Dominions who will have men to be his subjects, or such as will not renounce both their humanity and animality or sense.* For to perceive substances in genere & in specie by sense, and to believe or trust the Common senses of all the World about things sensible, as being the surest way that we have of perception, is as necessary to man as Reasoning is. Choose then O ye Princes of the Earth, whether you will be *Papists*, and whether you will have no men to be your Subjects, even none that believe the senses of themselves and all the world.

*Reas. XVIII.* Thus also your *Idolatry* exceedeth in absurdity the *Idolatry* of all the Heathens else in the World. Even *Canibals* and the most barbarous Nations upon Earth. For if they call men to Worship an Image, the Sun, the Moon, an Ox or an Onion (of which the Egyptians are accused) they do but say that some spiritual or celestial nutten affixeth his operative presence to this Creature: But they never make men swear that there is no Image, or Sun or Moon or Ox or Onion left,



left, but that the *whole substance* of it is turned into God, or somewhat else. Your Absurdities tend to make the grossest Idolatry seem comparatively to yours, a very fair and tolerable error.

*Reas. XIX.* By these means you expose *Christianity* to the *scorn* of *humane nature*, and all the world. You teach Heathens, Mahometans and other Infidels to deride Christ as we do *Mahomet*; and to say that a Christian *Maketh and Eateth his God*, and his faith is a *Believing that Gods supernatural Revelations are a lie*, and that God is like the Devil the great Deceiver of the world. Wo be to the world because of offences, and wo be to him by whom offence cometh.

*Reas. XX.* Lastly by this means you are the grand pernicious hinderers of the Conversion of the Heathen and Infidel world: For you do as it were proclaim to them; [*Never turn Christians till you will believe that Gods Natural Revelations are false, and that all mens senses in the world are deceived, in judging that there is Bread, Wine, or sensible substance after the words of Consecration.*]

These are the mischievous Consequents of your doctrine. But one benefit I confess doth come by occasion of it; That it is easier hereby to believe that there are Devils, when we see how they can deceive men: and to believe the evil of sin, when we see how it maketh men mad; and to believe that there is a Hell, when we see such a Hell already on Earth, as Learned Pompous Clergie men, that have studied to attain this malignant madness to decree to fry men in the flames and damn them to Hell, and give them no peace or quietness in the World, unless they will say, that Gods Natural Revelations are false, and that all mens senses are herein deceived, by God as the great deceiver of the World.



## CHAP. II.

*The Papists Answers to all this confuted.*

P. **I**T is easie to make any cause seem odious, till the accusations are answered, which I shall confidently do in the present case.

I. All this is but argument from sense : And sense must vail to *faith* : Gods word must be believed before our senses.

R. It is easie to cheat fools and children into a dream, with a sound of empty words : To talk of *senses vailing to faith* and such like Canting, and insignificant words, may serve turn with that sort of men. But sober men will tell you that *sense* is in *exercise* in order of *Nature* at least before *Reason* or *faith*, and that we are *Mena* and *Animals* before we are *Christians* : And that the *truth* and *certainty* of *faith*, presupposeth the *Truth* and *Certainty* of *sense*. Tell me else, if sense be false, how you know that there is a *Man*, or *Pope*, or *Priest* in the World ? that there is a *Book*, or *Voice*, or any being ? And what *possibility* then have you of *Believing* ?

P. Gods Revelation is surer than our senses ?

R. This is the old song over and over. Revelation without sense (to you and ordinary Christians at least) is a contradiction. How know you that God hath any revelations ? If by *preachers words*, How know you that there is a *preacher*, or a *word* but by sense ? If by *books*, How know you that there is a *book*, but by sense ?

P. II. We may trust sense in all other things, where  
God

God doth not contradict it: But not in this One Case, because God forbiddeth us.

R. Say so of your Church too, your Pope, Council or Traditions; that we may trust them in all cases save one or two, in which it is certain that they do lye! And will not any man conclude, that he that can lye in one case, can lye in more? If one Text of Gods word were false, and you would say, You may believe all the rest save that, how will you ever prove it? For the formal object of faith is gone, which is the *Divine Veracity*; He that can lye once, can lye twice. So if all our senses be false in this instance, how shall we know that they are ever true?

P. You may know it because God saith it.

R. 1. Where doth God say it? 2. How shall I be sure that he saith it? If you say, that it is written in Scripture; besides that there is no such word; How shall I know that all mens senses are not deceived in thinking that there is a *Scripture*, or such a word in it? If you say that the *Council* saith it, How shall I know that there is a *man* or ever was a *Council*, or a *Book* in the world? The certainty of *Conclusions* presupposeth the certainty of *premises* and *principles*: And the certainty of *faith* and *Reasoning*, presupposeth the certainty of sense: And if you deny this, you deny all, and in vain plead for the rest.

P. I must believe my senses, where I have no reason to disbelieve them. But when God contradicteth them, I have reason to disbelieve them.

R. 1. You vainly suppose without proof that God contradicteth them. So you may say, I may or must believe the Scripture or an Apostle, Prophet or Miracle, except God contradict them. But if God contradict them, he contradicteth his own word or revelation: For we have no other from him, but by man: And if he contradict

contradict himself, or his own word, how can I believe him, or know which of his words it is that's true, when one is false? so here: His *Natural Revelation* is his *first, nearest, and most satisfactory revelation*: And if that be said to be false by his *supernatural revelation*, which shall I believe, and why?

P. III. You cannot deny but God *can* deceive our senses. And therefore if he *can*, will you conclude against all faith if once he do it?

R. 1. This is not *once*; but as oft as God is worshipped in your Mass and our Sacrament.

2. God can *deceive* us without a *Lie*, but not by a *Lie*. Christ deceived the two Disciples, *Luke* 24. by carrying it *as if he would have gone further*; but not by saying that he would go further. God can do that from which he knoweth that man will take occasion of deceit. God can blind a mans eyes, or destroy or corrupt his other senses; he can present an object defectively, with unmeet mediums, distance, fire, &c. In this case he doth not give us a FALSE SIGN; nor doth he by the Nature of the Revelation oblige any man to believe it: Yea *Nature* saith, that a man is not to Judge by a *vitiated sense*, or an *unmeet medium*, or a *too distant object*, or where the due qualification of the sense or object are wanting: *Nature* there tells us that we are there to suppose or suspect that we are incapable of certainty: But *Nature* obligeth us to believe *sound senses* about *duly qualified objects*; and to take sense for sound when all the senses of all the men in the world agree; and the object to be a duly qualified object of sense, when all mens senses in the world so perceive it. For we have no way but by sense to know what is an object of sense.

3. The question is not what God *can* do by his power, if he will; but what God *will* do, and *can* will

to do, in consistency with his *perfection*, and just and merciful Government of the World. And God in making us *men* whose Intellects are naturally to perceive things sensible by the means of the perception of sense, doth naturally *oblige* man and *necessitate* him also, to trust his senses in such perception. And in *Nature* man hath no surer way of apprehension: Therefore if you could prove that sense is *ordinarily fallible*, and Gods *revelations* to it *false*, yet man were not only *allowed* but *necessitated* to use and trust it, as having no better *surer* way of apprehension: As among *many knaves* or *thieves*, I must most trust the *honestest* and *most trusty*, when I have no better to trust. If I am not sure that it is a *Sun* or *Light* that I see, yet I am sure that I must take my perception of it as a *Sun* or *Light* as it is; For God hath given me no better. If I am not sure that my sight, feeling, taste, &c. are infallible; yet I am sure that I am made of God to *use* them; and that I have *no better senses*, nor a better way to be certain of their *proper objects*: so that I must take and trust them as they are, or cease to be a man.

P. IV. Christs Body and Blood are not sensible objects; and therefore sense is no proper judge whether they be present.

R. This is one of your gross kind of cheats, to change the question. We are not yet come to the question, *Whether Christs Body and blood be here?* And I grant you that *sense* is no judge of that, any more than whether an Angel be here. But the question is now only, *Whether Bread or Wine or sensible substance be here?* And of this we have no natural way but by sense to judge.

P. V. If God should say to you [*Your senses are in this deceived; Here is no bread or wine or sensible substance*] Would you not believe him?

R. 1. Again

R. 1. Again I tell you, it is a supposition nor to be put : As if you should say, [*If God should say, that part of the Gospel or word of God is false, would you not believe him ?* ] 2. If I know that God telleth me that some disease or false medium, &c. deceive me or another in particular, I will believe him : But here it is supposed, 1. That I have assurance that it is God that tells me so ; 2. And that I have no assurance that common sense saith the contrary. But if the sense of all the world about a well scituate object of sense agree, will not take that to be *God's word* which contradiceth it till I have some evidence which is better and stronger than the agreeing senses of all the world to prove it to be so. And what evidence must that be ? I assure you somewhat greater than the authority of a beastly ignorant murdering Pope, and his factious Council.

P. VI. *Cartesius* giveth you an instance of deception of sight : We think a square Tower of a Steeple to be round till we come neer it : And the water seemeth to us to move when it is the boat.

R. *Cartesius* and you do seem to be Confederate, to put out the eye of nature, and tempt the world to Infidelity, if not to Atheism. 1. *Nature* tells us that a distant Steeple or other object, is not perfectly discernible and therefore *Nature* forbiddeth us to judge till we come neerer. We speak only of objects duly scituate and qualified. 2. The failing of the sight there is but Negative : It discerneth not the corners : but here you feign it to be positive. 3. As the error is corrigible by nearer approach, so also by the use of other sense. If a man feel the Tower that is square, he will infallibly perceive it. But if you could prove that this square Tower is no Tower, no Stone, no Substance at all, though all the world should judge otherwise that see it at the

meetest distance, and feel it with their hands, then you did something to the purpose.

So as to the moving water or banks, 1. Motion is not so evident as *substance*. 2. Though *one sense*, through the weakness of the brain be insufficient, the *Intellect* by the *same sense* about other objects, and by *other senses* can infallibly discern what that one perceiveth not. 3. And if one mans eyes deceive him who is in the *boat*, *ten thousand mens* eyes that stand on the *firm land*, perceive the truth: But in our case it is all the senses of all the world, in all ages, about the *nearest object*, that agree.

P. VII. *Substance* is not the proper object of *sense*, but only *Accidents*: We see, feel, taste, smell the accidents, but not the substances.

R. 1. If you can name some notional speculator or *Word-maker* that hath said so, you think you have *authority* to renounce *humanity* by it. Call it *proper* or *not-proper*, *substance* is the certain object of *sense* as clothed with its accidents. *Quantity* and the *res quanta* are not two things, but one: And he that feel-  
eth or seeth *quantity*, feeleth or seeth the *rem quantum*. He that seeth or feeleth *shape* or *figure*, seeth or feeleth the thing figured. He that smelleth odor, smelleth *rem odoratam*; He that seeth Colour, seeth the *rem coloratam*. When to feel the superficies, you feel the substance.

2. By this we see how by *words* you will unman mankind. Have you *any way of perception* of *corporal substances* but by *sense*? Do you *know* that there is *any Earth* or *Water*, or any *corporal substance* in the world, or not? If you do, tell us *how* you know it but by the perception of *sense* presenting it to the *Intellect*? You know that you must *thus know it*, or not at all.

3. And thus still you would bring men with *Scepticism*



cism to Infidelity. You would teach men, that they that saw Christ were not sure that they saw him or any substance at all, but only the accidents, called Quantity, Shape, Colour, &c. They that saw Apostles, Miracles, Bibles, Councils, were not sure that they saw any more than accidents, &c.

P. VIII. They that saw Angels appearing to them like men, or the Holy Ghost descending on Christ in the shape of a Dove, thought they saw *Men* and a *Dove* : So *Moses Rod* did seem a Serpent. But their senses did deceive them.

R. Their senses were not at all deceived : And if by rash judging they would go *beyond sense*, and wilfully deceive themselves, it was their fault. Their sense saw the *shape or likeness* of a *man and dove*. The text saith, not that the Holy Ghost was a *dove*, but that it *descended in the likeness of a Dove* : and their senses perceived no more. And this was true. A man consisteth of a soul and a body of flesh and blood : Did sense perceive any of this in the Angels? either, soul, flesh or blood? or any such thing in the appearance of a *dove*? If I see your picture or statue, is my sense deceived if I take it not for a *living man*? If I see it *moved*, is my sense deceived if I take it not for any other than a *moving Image*? Nature doth not bind me to take every *simile* to be *idem*; a *corps* for a *man*; an *Image* for the *person*. It will be foolishness so to take it. But if this *Angel*, or *Dove*, had come near to the *senses*, all the *senses*, of all sorts of men, and they had *seen*, and *felt*, and *tasted*, and *smelt*, all that are the objects of these senses, and yet there had been indeed no visible, tactile, sensible *substance at all*, this had been a deception of the senses remediless. Christ I am sure appealed to sense, to prove that he had flesh and blood and was not a meer spirit. The same I say of *Moses Rod* : either it was



was really a Serpent or not; If it was, then it was no deception to judge it such: If not, sense was not at all deceived: For it perceived nothing but the similitude and motion, and those (with the substance) were certainly there. But if all mens senses, seeing, feeling, tasting, &c. had been deceived, and there had been indeed no shape of a Serpent, nor any *sensible substance* at all but Accidents real without any substance, this had been indeed a deception of the senses. And if God so subvert mans nature, he will not bind him to do the things which belong to the nature of man to do.

But by all this we may perceive, that there is no end of Controversies with you to be hoped for: For how is it possible to bring any thing to a more satisfying issue, than when the senses of all the world do as clearly perceive it, as any sensible thing can be perceived? If our difference were whether this be Paper, and these be Letters; or whether this be a Pen, a Table, yea or a substance, and I should appeal to the sense of all the World, and yet this will not serve to decide the Controversie; what end, or hope of ending can there be: I will sooner look for concord with a mad man, than with men that deny the senses of all the World.

## CHAP.

## CHAP. III.

*The second Argument against Transubstantiation : The Contradictions of it.*

R. Arg. 2. **G**Od owneth not Contradictions (nor can do). The Papists doctrine of Transubstantiation, or nullification of the whole substance of Bread and Wine, is contradictory : Therefore it is not owned by God.

The Major I know no man that denyeth.

The Contradictions are these.

I. You feign many *Accidents* of *no substance* ; which is a gross contradiction. For to be an *Accident* is essentially *Relative* to a subject or substance : And *ejus esse est inesse*. To be a *Father* without a *Son*, or a *Son* without a *Father*, a *Husband* without a *Wife*, or a *Wife* without a *Husband*, &c. are contradictions : And so it is to be an *Accident* of *nothing*, or without a subject.

Particularly, 1. The *quantity* of *nothing* is a contradiction : We can *measure* the Bread, and Wine : To be an *inch* in longitude, latitude or profundity, and yet to be *no substance* is a contradiction. To be (as the Wine is) a *quart*, a *gallon* of *Nothing* is a contradiction.

2. So for *number* ; we can number the *wafers* or *pieces* of Bread, and the *Cups* of Wine : And to be *twenty*, *forty*, an *hundred* *nothings*, is a contradiction.

3. So for the *Weight*, To be an *ounce*, a *pound*, or *ten pound*, of *nothing*, is a contradiction.

4. So

4. So for the *figure* or *shape*: It is a contradiction to be a *round nothing*, a *square nothing*, &c.

5. So is it to be a *sweet nothing*, a *sharp nothing*, an *austere nothing*, &c. as the *Wine* is fancied by you.

6. Or to be an *odoriferous nothing*: A *rough* or a *smooth nothing*, &c.

7. Or to be a *white nothing*, or a *red nothing*, or any coloured *nothing*. The same I may say of *size*, and of a multitude of Relations, &c.

I. I. It is a contradiction, for *Nothing* to have all those *Real notable effects*, which it is certain that the consecrated *Bread* and *Wine* have.

As, 1. That when a man or a beast, is really nourished by the *Bread* and *Wine*; and *flesh* and *blood*, and *spirits* are made of it, (as they may live by it many months,) that these should be the effects of *nothing*, or made out of *no substance* by way of *Nutrition*, without a proper *Creation*.

2. When the Consecrated *Bread* and *Wine* do partly turn to *Excrements*, *Urine*, *Dung* and *Spirits*, that all the *Excrements* are *nothings* or *made of nothing* without a new *Creation*, is a contradiction.

3. When the *Wine* shall (as it may do) make a *man* or a *swine drunk*, that he is made *drunk* by *nothing* or *no substance*, when as that *drunkenness* is essentially the operation of the *spirits* of the *Wine* upon the *spirits* of him that drinks it, this also is a contradiction. And God maketh not contradictions true.

P. It is the plea of an Infidel to say that *God* cannot do this or that. Will you limit the power of the Almighty? Will you say that *God* cannot make *Quantity*, *quality*, *fire*, &c. without *substance*, because we cannot? It is blasphemy to say *God* cannot.

R. God *can* do All things that are *works of Power*: God *can* do *nothing* which is a work of *Impotency, defectiveness, naughtiness, or folly*, or which are contradictions in themselves. And when we say *God cannot*, we do but say either that God is *Perfect and Almighty*, or that the thing is *Nothing*, but a false name, and not capable of being any ones work. God *cannot lye*, because he is perfect and Almighty, and not because he wanteth power. God cannot make you to be a *man* and *no man*, a *substance* and *no substance*, in the same sence, at the same time: because it is a contradiction.

But if this Argument did not hold, and it were no contradiction, for God to overturn his settled course of Nature, I shall shew you next that we have other reasons enough to judge that he doth it not. If he *Can* make darkness to give Light, and a clod to be to the World instead of the Sun, without changing it, or a stone to understand and speak without changing it, yet that God *doth* none of this, both reason and experience prove.

## CHAP. IV.

*The Third Argument against Transubstantiation: from the certain falshood of their assertion of Multitudes of Miracles in it.*

R. **T**Hat doctrine which asserteth a multitude of false or feigned Miracles is false and not of God : But such is the doctrine of Transubstantiation —  
*Ergo* —

I will 1. Shew you what Miracles it asserteth ; and  
 2. Prove that they are feigned or false.

I. It is a Miracle for *Bread and Wine* to be turned into no *Bread and Wine*, yea, into *nothing* ; and this by the *speaking* of four words.

I I. It is a Miracle ( or Contradiction ) for the *Bread and Wine* to be turned into *Christs Body and Blood*, and yet neither the *matter* nor *form* of it to become any of the matter of *Christs body and blood*.

I I I. It is a Miracle, ( or a contradiction rather as aforesaid ) for the *Accidents* to be the *Accidents of Nothing*, or no *substance* ; to be the *quantity* of *Nothing*, the *shape*, the *number* of *nothing*, the *colour*, *savour*, *smell* of *nothing*, and so of all the rest.

I V. It is a Miracle to have all the sound senses of all sorts of men in the world so deceived herein, as to perceive *bread, wine* and *substance*, if there be none.

V. It is a Miracle to have the senses of Mice and Rats, and Dogs and other Brutes also deceived when they eat and drink it.

V I. It is a Miracle ( or contradiction ) to have *nothing* without a *Creation*, to become *excrements* : or else those *excrements* to be *nothing* also : And the

*Accidents* of all those *excrements* to be the *Accidents* of *Nothing*.

VII. It is a Miracle to be *nourished* by *Nothing* : ( For you say, that it is not *Christs* body and blood that nourisheth the flesh. ) To have flesh and blood made of *nothing*, is a creation.

VIII. It is a Miracle to be *drunk* with *nothing*, when the *Wine* is annihilated or gone, and seemeth to be it that causeth the effect : Yea, for Beast or man to be so drunk.

IX. It is a Miracle ( or contradiction ) for Christ to eat his own body ( as the Papists hold he did ), and yet it was his *Whole Body* which did eat his *body*, and yet he had but one body.

X. It was a Miracle ( or contradiction ) for *Christs* entire body to be nourished by that eaten body, and that the eaten body turned into the substance of his eating body. And yet all was but one.

XI. It was a Miracle that *Christs* *Eaten body* being not dead but living with a humane soul, should be broken and eaten by him and his disciples, and yet feel no pain by it.

XII. It was a Miracle that his whole body was on the Cross, and yet part of it in the disciples bellies at that time ; or at least before that eaten by them.

XIII. It was a Miracle ( or contradiction ) that *Christs* eaten body now nourisheth not the flesh of any man ; and yet did nourish the flesh of the disciples before his death. Or if it did not nourish them, it was a Miracle that what they eat and drank then did not nourish them, ( or Christ what he eat and drank ).

XIV. It was a Miracle that the whole body of Christ should arise and live, and ascend to Heaven, when the disciples had eaten it.

X V. It is a Miracle that every Receiver eateth the whole body of Christ, and not a part, and yet that he hath but one body, or that they eat each a part without dividing him.

X V I. It is a Miracle that as soon as the species of *Bread* and *Wine* perish or cease in the Eater, Christs body and blood ceaseth to be in him, and this without his detriment.

X V I I. It is a Miracle that there is such a local distance between the consecrated bread and wine all over the world; and yet no such distance between the parts of Christs body, and yet that bread to be his body.

X V I I I. It is a Miracle that bread and wine is Annihilated or cease every Mass, and yet that the quantity of corporeal matter in the whole world is no whit diminished: or else that those four words can so annihilate and diminish the matter of the world.

X I X. It is a Miracle that Christs body and blood increase not, when so many millions of parcells of bread and wine are turned into it.

X X. It is a Miracle that Christs body and blood is not diminished, when by the Corruption of the species of bread and wine, it vanisheth away.

X X I. It is a Miracle that Christs body and blood should be so received into the bowels of a wicked man, and yet not be any way defiled by his sin, nor by his bodily uncleanness.

X X I I. It is a Miracle that a Baker dispositively, and a Priest effectually can make his own God, and eat him when they have done.

X X I I I. It is a Miracle that when Worms are bred of that which was bread and wine, these worms are really generated of *nothing*, or created; (or if as some say, the bread and wine do substantially return again, and breed them, that is another, a double miracle.)



XXIV. And it is a Miracle that the Corporeal matter of the world should by these Worms be daily increased, out of nothing, or out of meer accidents that have no substance.

XXV. It is a Miracle that men may be poysoned by the Sacramental Elements as ingredients in the mixture, and yet that they are no substance.

XXVI. It is a Miracle or Contradiction, that when *flesh* and *blood* ( formally such ) enter not into the Kingdom of God, but Glorified bodies are all *spiritual bodies* ( though not Spirits ), and therefore not *flesh* and *blood* : Yet Christs *body* in the Sacrament should be truly and properly *flesh* and *blood*, and yet the same with his glorified body ( which is not *flesh* and *blood* : ) which is the Papists doctrine ; and the bread turned into such *flesh*.

XXVII. It is a Miracle that the same *Body* which in Heaven is brighter in Glory than the Sun, and exalted above Angels, should yet shew no signs of Glory on the Altar, in the Cup, in the hand, mouth or belly of him that taketh it ; but all its Glory be so hid.

XXVIII. It is a Miracle ( or Contradiction ) that Christs Humiliation should be past, and his whole Body Glorified, and yet that to be torn with the teeth of a wicked man, to be eaten by Mice, Rats or Dogs, to go into the filthy guts, to be trodden in the dirt, should be neither painful, nor any diminution of the Glory of that same body. Indeed his body on the Cross might be broken, and his blood spilt and trodden on, because he was a sacrifice for sin ; and it was the time of his Voluntary Humiliation : But now for the suffering of death he is crowned with Glory and Honour, *Heb.* 2. 9, 7.

XXIX. It is a Miracle that the *Living Body* of our Glorified Redeemer should give no evidence or sign of life ;

life; neither stir, nor speak, nor have breath, pulse, warmth, or other property of life appearing.

XXX. It is a Miracle, at least, that *flesh* should have none of the common notes or properties of flesh, not to be made of food, of blood and chyme, not to consist of the *fibræ* which flesh consisteth of; not to have the colour, taste, odour or other such accidents of flesh: And that Blood should have none of these notifying accidents of *blood*.

XXXI. It is a Miracle or Contradiction; that *Christs Flesh* was *Broken* before it was broken, sacrificed before it was sacrificed, I mean really broken and sacrificed at his Supper, when yet he was whole and not really sacrificed till he was nailed to the Cross. And so that his blood was really and properly shed in his Supper, and yet no skin broken, nor his blood really shed till his side was pierced on the Cross. And that he that was but *once offered* and *sacrificed*, should yet be offered and sacrificed once on one day, and another time on another day.

Here are one and thirty Miracles or Contradictions: Let us hear some of the Aggravations of them, as worthy to be considered.

I. It is a Miracle of these Miracles, that there should be as many Miracle workers as Priests in the world: How many thousand are they in *France* alone? And so in many other Countreys. Whereas in Christs own time, they were comparatively but few,

II. That the Pope or any Prelate can make a Miracle worker when he please, yea, a thousand; as if the Holy Ghost were at his will.

III. It is a Miracle of these Miracles that a Simonist who buyeth the Priesthood with money, doth buy the Holy Ghost to work Miracles for that money, which *Simon Magus* was condemned for thinking possible.

For the Papists hold, that the Consecration of a Simoniacal Priest transubstantiareth.

I V. It is a Miracle that all this power of Miracles should be given to flagitious wicked men ; Adulterers, Murderers, Drunkards, &c.

V. It is a Miracle that all these men can work Miracles at their *own will and pleasure*, at any hour : whereas the Apostles had not the Spirit at command, and could not do it when they would.

V I. It is a Miracle that Miracles should be as common as Masses, or the Eucharistical worshipping of God ; not only on every Lords Day in all Church-assemblies, but any day or hour else in the Week. And so Miracles be as ordinary almost as to eat and drink.

V I I. It is a Miracle that every wicked Priest should do so many Miracles in one, and so many more in number than *Christ himself* did, in the same proportion of time, as far as the History of the Gospel telleth us : Christ is quite exceeded by them all.

V I I I. It is a Miracle that every wicked Priest can work all these Miracles *so easily*, as with the careless saying over *four words* : When the *Apostles* could not cast out some Devils, or work some Miracles, and some could not be done but by *fasting and prayer*.

I X. It is a Miracle that every Priest can work all these Miracles upon an *unbeliever* or a *wicked man* : For to such they say, it is the *real flesh and blood of Christ*, and *no bread or wine* ; And the *senses* of all these *wicked men* are deceived. Whereas Christ himself could not do any great miraculous work among some where he came, *because of their unbelief*.

X. It is a Miracle that God and the Priest should do these foresaid Miracles on *Mice and Rats* and other *Beasts*, by deceiving their senses, which we find not  
that

that Christ ever did : or that God should feed them with the miraculous accidents aforesaid.

X I. It is a Miracle of these Miracles that the Priest can thus easily work Miracles not only on *other creatures*, but on the *glorified body of Christ himself*, (by the foresaid changes, &c. )

X I I. It is a Miracle, that when Christ wrought his Miracles usually before a far smaller number, these Priests work Miracles thus before or on the *senses of all the men in the world* that will be present at the Mass ; for all their senses are deceived.

X I I I. It is a Miracle that the Abassines, Armenians, Greeks, Protestants, yea, any that they call Schismatics, and Hereticks, who do

*Vid. Aquin. 3. q. 82. a. 7. c.*

not intend to work any Miracle, nor believe Transubstantiation, do yet work Miracles in each Sacramental administration of the Eucharist, not only *without their knowledge*, but *contrary to their belief*, and *against their wills* : For they say, that even such mens consecration is effectual.

X I V. Either their Priests consecration worketh all these Miracles, when they *intend it, not*, ( as if they

*Vid. Aquin. 3. q. 69. a. 9.*

speake the words in jeast or scorn, or in Infidelity, ) or only when they *intend it*. If the first be said, it is a Miracle of Miracles, that any Priest can work so many and great Miracles by a jeast or scorn——If not, then all the business is come to nothing, and no one but the Priest knoweth whether there be any such Miracle at all, and whether ever he eat the flesh of Christ : And so it will be in the power of the Priest to deceive and damn all the people, according to the Papists exposition of Christs words, Joh. 6. *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you have no life in you.*

X V.

X V. Either a malicious intention to a wrong end will be effectual in Consecration, or not. If not, none but the Priest knoweth that there is any body and blood of Christ, or that ever he received any: Because none knoweth though the Priest intend Consecration, whether he intend it to a right end. But if a wicked end will serve (as I think most of them hold) the Miracle may be great and sad. For any Roguish drunken malicious Priest may undo a Baker or Vintner at his pleasure, and by four words deprive him of all his Bread and Wine: Yea, he might nullifie all the *Bread and Wine* in the *City*, and so either make a famine at his pleasure, or else make whole *Families* and *Cities* live still and be nourished without any *substance* by bare *Accidents*, which would be a *Miracle* indeed.

If the Priest can by consecration change *only a convenient quantity of bread and wine*, then all that is *overmuch* is *bread and wine* after consecration. If otherwise, why may he not change all the bread and wine in the Shop or Cellar where he cometh, intending consecration to an ill end?

If he can do it only on the *Altar*, then want of an *Altar* would frustrate the effect (which they hold not). But if he can do it *without an Altar* he may do it in the *Shop and Cellar*.

If he can do it only on the *bread and wine present*, how *near* must it be? Then the words will work at *so many yards* distance, and not at *so many*. Or if he cannot do it *out of sight*, a *blind Priest* cannot do it. But if he can do it on that which is *absent*, we may fear lest in an anger he may take away all the bread and wine in the *Land*; at least in a frolick to try his power.

XVI. And it is some aggravaion of these manifold Miracles that a *Degraded Priest* can do them: Because *Vid. Aquin. 2. 2. 82. a. 8.* they follow the indelible Character: And so he that hath once made a Miracle-worker, cannot take away his power again, nor his *sin* lose his power. Is not this a marvellous power of Miracles, which becometh like a *nature* to them, as the power of speaking is?

XVII. Yet is this Miracle-working-power more miraculous, in that a mans own *unwillingness*, or *Repentance* of his Calling cannot hinder the Miracle if he do but speak four words. *Consent* it *self* is not necessary to it: Let a man *Repent* that ever he was a *Priest*, and profess that he continueth in that Calling against his will, yea, let him write as I now do against *Transubstantiation*, yet all this will not hinder his next Consecration from working all the foresaid Miracles.

XVIII. It is miraculous that if you keep a consecrated Wafer never so long, if you use it never so courslly, if you (as he did who occasioned the conversion of Mr. *Anthony Egan* a late *Irish Priest*) pawn it at an Ale-house for thirty shillings; if you lay it down for a stake at Cards or Dice, &c. it will not cease to be *Christs flesh* (and so by his blood,) nor ever becomes bread, or any other substance till it corrupt: And yet in a mans stomach it ceaseth to be *Christs body*, as natural heat corrupteth it by concoction: And yet it is not *Christs flesh* that is concocted.

XIX. It is a Miracle of this Miracle which *Aquinas* and others assert, that the Bread and Wine are not *Annihilated*, but wholly turned into *Christs body* and blood; and yet, as *Vasquez* saith, *It is not that the matter of bread begins to be under the form of Christs body* (as *Durandus* held.) Saith *Veron Reg. fid. cap. 5.*

[ This

This *Transubstantiation* is neither a change nor a production of any thing ; but it is a Relation of order between the substance that doth desist to be, and that into which it doth desist. And yet saith the *Concil. Trident.* There is a change made of the whole substance into, &c.

X X. Lastly, It is a Miracle that all these Miracles should be done so as not to appear to the senses of any man living, either to Convert Unbelievers or Confirm the faithful : So that millions of these Miracles are seen and not seen ; the Priest, and Action, and Accidents are seen, but no Miracle seen by any. So that *Aquinas* concludeth 3. q. 76. a. 7, [ Though Christ be existent in this Sacrament *per modum substantiæ*, yet neither bodily eyes, nor our Intellects can see him, but by faith : no nor the Intellect of an Angel can see him *secundum sua naturalia* ; nor do Devils see him but by faith ; nor the blessed, but in the Divine Essence. ]

All these make these Miracles far more miraculous than the raising of *Lazarus* from the dead,

---

Whether all these are Miracles, or most or many of them Contradictions, and therefore Impossibilities, I make no great matter of at this time. I think it utterly needless to add any more to what is said in answer to such sayings as *Aquinas's* ( 3. q. 75. & 76. ) and other Schoolmen, that [ The senses are not deceived, because there are the Accidents, and the Intellect is by faith preserved from deception : that the remaining accidents are in quantitate dimensiva quasi in subjecto : that these Accidents can change an extrinsick body, can be corrupted, can generate Worms, can nourish, can be broken, &c. ] For all this at least confesseth, that its all done by Miracle : ( Though I will



will say, 1. That they could scarce have chosen a more unhappy pro-subject of Accidents than Quantity, nor have given more unhappy reasons for it than *Aquinas* doth q. 77. a. 2. c. 1. *Because the sense perceiveth that it is Aliquid quantum, that is coloured.* 2. *Because Quantity is the first disposition of matter, &c.* For this includeth matter: and *Aliquid quantum* is a word that giveth away his Cause: And no Accident is more the same with its subject than *Quantity*, or *moles extensiva*. 2. And he will be long before he will make or prove mans nature to be such, as that his Intellect can judge of substances by Believing, as incomplex objects, before it have perceived them by sense and imagination. When we see, taste, smell, feel, hear them, the Intellect will suddenly and necessarily have some species or perception of the Thing, before it come *Logically* to dispute from *extrinseck* media of Testimony, What this thing is in a second notion. And our question is, Whether the Intellect in this first Perception be deceived, or not? If you discharge the Intellect from perceiving substances presently, before it know them by second notions or Argument, you will make man quite another thing, than every hour and action tells us he is: But what will not a man say, when he sets himself only to study what to say for the making good of his undertaken Cause?

But my next work is to prove the Falshood of these pretended Miracles.

## CHAP.

## CHAP. V.

*The Minor proved, viz. That these Miracles are false.*

**T**Hat these are all but feigned Miracles, I thus prove.  
 I. Because the holy Scriptures do plainly deny such an ordinariness or commonness of the gift of Miracles. 1 Cor. 12. 8, 9, 10, 11. [*To one is given by the spirit the word of Wisdom, to another the word of Knowledge by the same spirit, to another faith by the same spirit, to another the gifts of healing by the same spirit, to another the working of miracles, &c. But all these worketh that one and the self same spirit; dividing to every man severally as he will.* 28, 29. *And God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, Governments, diversities of tongues: Are all Apostles? are all Prophets? are all Teachers? are all workers of Miracles.*]

Here it is most expressly told us, that working Miracles is a peculiar gift of some, and even in those times not common to all that were Priests. But the Papists make it common to every Priest, though a common Adulterer, Drunkard, Murderer or Heretick; no one Priest in the world is without it.

I I. Though some few that were workers of iniquity might have some such gifts, *Matth. 7.* Yet that was so rare, that Nature it self taught men to judge Miracles to be signs of divine approbation: so that *Nicodemus* thence argueth, *Joh. 3. 2.* *No man could do these Miracles that thou dost except God be with him.* And the

the man *Joh. 9. 31. God heareth not sinners, but if any man be a Worshipper of God and doth his will, him he heareth.* And the people, *vers. 16. How can a man that is a sinner do such Miracles?* And it was Christs own proof that he was of God, and his Gospel true; and therefore to *Blaspheam his Miracles*, by ascribing them to the Devil, was the unpardonable *Blasphemy* of the *Holy Ghost*: And to deny *Miracles* to be a sign of Gods attestation is to subvert all Christianity. *Act. 2. 22. Jesus of Nazareth a man approved of God among you by miracles, wonders and signs which God did by him in the midst of you — Joh. 5. 36. The same works that I do bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me. Joh. 10. 25, 37, 38. The works that I do in my Fathers name, they bear witness of me — If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not: But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works, that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him.*

*Joh. 14. 11. Believe me for the very works sake.*

*Joh. 15. 24. If I had not done among them the works that no other man did, they had not had sin.*

This also was Pauls proof of his Apostleship, yea and of the truth of all the Apostles doctrine: *Heb. 2. 3, 4. God also bearing them witness both with signs and wonders, and divers Miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own Will.*

2 Cor. 12. 12.  
Rom. 15. 19.  
Act. 14. 3  
& 15. 12.

Therefore that Doctrine is unlike to be true, which tells us that every wicked Priest in the world, though a Simonist, or an enemy of Christ and Godlineſs, and drown'd in all Vice, is such a constant miracle-worker: When God hateth all the workers of iniquity, *Psal. 5. 5.*

Matth. 21. 15.

III. But though this Reason be but *probable*, this following is *demonstrative* to a *believer*.

*That doctrine which maketh every Ignorant wicked or Heretical Priest in the world, far to excell the Prophets, Apostles, and Christ himself, in the Greatness, Number and facility of Miracles, is false : But such is this doctrine of Transubstantiation —*

I know that Christ telleth his Apostles [*Greater works than these shall ye do.*] But 1. There are *Greater works* (such as the converting of greater numbers in the world) which are not *Greater Miracles* : 2. And what was promised to the *Apostles*, as to *Miracles*, was not promised to *every Priest* in the world.

I appeal to the Consciences of sober Christians, whether it sound not as an arrogant if not blasphemous speech, to say that *Christ and his Apostles did fewer and smaller miracles* (proportionable to their time) *than every Priest*.

And as to the Minor, it is soon proved in its parts.

1. As to the *Greatness* of the *Miracles* : those of Christ were *exceeding Great* : especially his *Raising Lazarus*, and his *own Resurrection*, his *turning water into Wine*, and his *feeding thousands with a little food* — But he that will examine *Transubstantiation* as afore-described, shall find it to have more that is *contrary to nature*, than all these, by far. The substance of the dead body of Christ or *Lazarus* did not vanish, but remained to be the *organized Recipient matter* of the re-entring soul. There were *no Accidents without substances*, or other such things as are mentioned before. The multiplying of food, could at the most be but a *new Creation* ; But it was *real food*, and none of the contradictions or absurdities before recited. The turning of *Water into Wine* was *likest this* in the *Papists opinion*, but indeed little like it. For the *matter* of the  
water

water there remained, with the *form of Wine*, and so became the *Matter of Wine*, and did not vanish: And here was *real Wine*, and *real substance*, and not *Accidents without substances*, deceiving all the senses or *Intellectual perceptions*. The same may be said of the miracles of the Apostles, compared with Transubstantiation.

2. And as to the *Number*, though Christs and his Apostles Miracles were *very many*, yet there is no Scripture-evidence that they were for number comparable (for so much time) to *every Priests*. Christs miracles are set down in the sacred history in *such order*, and the Evangelists so much agree in reciting the *same miracles*, that (though St. John say) the world could not contain the Books that should be written—— yet we find no probability that they were neer so common as *Masses* are: when in several places where Christ came, they that looked after Miracles and Signs were denied them, and had none, but were put off to the sign of the Prophet *Jonah*, &c. Yea *Herod* and *Pilate* were in this denied their *desired satisfaction*; and they that call to him for a miracle on the Cross. And so of the Apostles. But every Priest doth his miracles *as oft as there is a Mass*, though every day.

3. And as to the *Facility* I said before, that [in his own Country, among his own kindred, he could do no mighty work save that he layed his hands on a few sick folk and healed them, and he marvelled at their unbelief] Mark 6. 4, 5, 6. And he some time groaned in spirit, and wept, (as for *Lazarus*). And the Disciples could not cast out a Devil, Mar. 9. 18, 28. Luk. 9. 40. It was not to be done but by *fasting and prayer*. Its like Paul would have cured *Trophimus* if he could, when he left him sick. And as holy men spake, not when, nor as they pleased, but *when and as they were inspired by the*

*Holy Ghost*: so did they work miracles, not arbitrarily, but at such times and in such manner as the spirit moved them.

But any the most wicked Priest can do it at his pleasure, any hour of the day: and that but by reciting *Hoc est corpus meum*. Many other disparities appear in what is said before.

IV. The *End* of the Gift of Miracles confuteth the feigned Miracles of Transubstantiation. The *End* of Christs gift was to prove him to be of God (as is aforeshewed) and to prove his *Apostles to be of God*, and to confirm the Gospel which they Preached, *Mar. 16. 17, 18, 19, 20. Heb. 2. 4.* As the gift of Tongues so other wonders, were to convince unbelievers, *1 Cor. 14. Act. 2. & 4. 30. & 5. 12. & 7. 36. & 8. 13. & 14. 3. 2 Cor. 12. 12.*

But the miracles of Transubstantiation are known to no unbeliever; nor to any one in the world by any sense; and have no such *End*, but a contrary effect.

The Apostles who were to convert the world, and next Christ, to do the greatest good, were therefore to do the greatest miracles: And it was their argument for Christ, *Joh. 7. 31. When Christ cometh will he do more miracles than these which this man hath done?* Yet now every ignorant Priest pretendeth to far more, who doth but tempt Infidels to deride Christianity by the pretence; as we do Mahometanism, for *Mahomets* sport pretended with the Moon, and other such delirations.

V. God is not to be said to work Miracles and cross the established course of nature without proof. But these pretended Miracles have no proof — No man living perceiveth them by sense. And that God telleth us of no such things by supernatural Revelation, shall be further shewed anon: In the mean time, it may satisfie us,

us, that they bring us no proof, but their own affirmation, which they require us to believe.

VI. The *Matter* of these pretended Miracles is expressly contradicted by the Word of God, as shall be proved in the next Chapter.

VII. *Ad hominem*; Do not the Papists forget themselves here, and contradict their other suppositions?

1. They make Miracles to be one evidence of *sanctity*; and therefore *Canonize* men, when they think that they have proof that they wrought Miracles: And yet maintain that a Whoremonger, Drunkard, or Heretick may do many more.

So they do by forbidding to eat flesh in Lent: And yet say they eat Christs flesh in Lent: When Irenaeus cited by Occumenius Com. in 1 Pet. 2. 2. bringeth in Blandina proving to the Jews, that Christians did not eat flesh and drink blood in the Eucharist, because that they use even to abstain for exercise sake, from Lawful flesh.

2. They make Miracles a proof that they are the true Church; and say that among us there are no Miracles; and yet they confess that every Priest, among us and all others, whom they account Schismaticks and Hereticks, do more Miracles than *Christ did*; if they consecrate frequently.

3. They burn men to ashes for *working miracles*, even for *making God*; if so be, they do it not in the Roman fashion.

4. They confess that the other Sacraments are not thus made up of Miracles; no not *Baptism*, which is our *Christening*, and washeth us from our sins: And yet this Sacrament alone, must by a multitude of Miracles differ from the rest.

4. Whether the Doctrine of their St. Thomas and his followers and others, that the *formal words* of this Sacrament have a created effective virtue by which they instrumentally make the change (3. q. 78. a. 4. c.) be not an absurdity rather than a proper miracle. For



words Physically move but the *air* first, and the *terminus* of the *aires* motion ( *e.g.* the *ear* ) next : and next that, if it be an intellectual, or other animal recipient, the *sense*, and *fantasie* next, and so on : But the *Bread* and *Wine* have no *sense* nor *fantasie* nor *Intellect* : And to say that the *moved aire* is the means of turning them into the body and blood of Christ, is still to multiply miracles.

5. Do they not too much magnifie the *common work* ( and consequently the *office* ) of a *Priest*, above the work of a *Pope* or *Prelate*, who seldom consecrate ? when the *Priest* worketh so many *Miracles* more than they ?

6. They conclude that a sinner that hath *Voluntatem peccandi* receiveth Baptism in vain, as to its ends of pardoning him, and therefore should not receive it ( *Concil. Rom. Epist. Gregor. 7. Aquin. 3. q. 68. a. 4. c. &c.* ) And yet, be the sinner never such an hypocrite or Infidel, he eateth Christs real flesh nevertheless, yea against his will, if he do but the outward act.

7. Is it not strange that an *Infidel* receiveth as verily the real flesh and blood of Christ as a *Saint*, and yet not the *benefits* or *effects* ? As if Christs flesh and blood could be in a mans body without his benefit : When he hath promised that *he that eateth him, shall live by him*. Yet see the measures of their faith and Church : Saith *Aquinas* ( 3. q. 80. a. 3. ad 2. ) [ *Unless perhaps an Infidel intend to Receive that which the Church giveth, though he have not true faith about other Articles or about this Sacrament* ] then he may receive sacramentally.

## CHAP. VI.

*The fourth Argument. This Miraculous Transubstantiation is expressly contrary to the Word of God, in Scripture.*

Arg. 4. **T**HE Papists say that there is no bread after the words of Consecration : Gods word saith, There is *Bread* after the Consecration : Therefore the Papists speak contrary to the Word of God.

I. In 1 Cor. 11. It is called expressly BREAD after consecration no less than three times in three verses together, 26, 27, 28. [*“ For as oft as ye eat this Bread and Drink this cup, ye shew the Lords death till he come. Wherefore whosoever shall eat this Bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the Body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that Bread and drink of that Cup ”*]: Here they that call for *express words of Scripture* for our doctrine, without our consequences, may see their own faith expressly contradicted, and our opposition justified : The Holy Ghost here expressly calleth it *Bread* : And yet no expressness nor evidence will satisfie them.

P. By *Bread* is meant that which *was Bread* before, or else that which *nourisheth* the soul as *Bread* doth the body : And so it is metonymically only called *Bread*, as Christs Flesh is called *Bread* in *Joh. 6.*

R. Why then do you call for *express* texts of Scripture as our proof, when that *expressness* signifieth nothing with you ; but you can say, It is a *metonymie* or a *metaphor* at your pleasure. But you say so against notorious Evidence : The Apostle calleth it *Bread* so

often over and over, as if he had foreseen your inhumane heresie. He calleth it *The Bread which is to be Eaten*, joyned with *Drinking the Cup*; never once calling either of them the *Flesh* or *Blood* of *Christ*, but as he reciteth Christs words which he expoundeth. Yea he telleth us that *eating this bread*, and *drinking this cup*, is to shew the Lords death till he come; where he calleth us to look back at Christs death as past, in our *Commemoration*, and to look forward to his *personal coming* as future; but never telleth us that we must kill Christ and eat him our selves (when we have made him), nor that his body is there present under the accidents of Bread and Wine.

But the rest of the Scriptures as expressly justifie our doctrine. 1 Cor. 10. 15. *The Cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion (or Communication) of the blood of Christ? And the Bread which we break, is it not the communion (or participation) of the body of Christ?* Here it is the Cup and the Bread after Consecration, if the Holy Ghost may be believed.

And in the next words the Apostle repeateth it in his reason [*For we being Many are One Bread, and One Body; For we all partake of one Bread (or Loaf).*] Is not here exprels proof?

So *Act. 20. 7.* When we came together to *break Bread* — And *v. 11.* He *ascending, and breaking bread, and eating &c.* Here it is twice more called Bread after the Consecration (which ever went before the *Breaking*).

So *Act. 2. 42, 46.* It is twice more called *Breaking of Bread*.

And what else can the recitation of Christs institution mean. 1 Cor. 11. 23, 24. *Panem accepisse, fregisse, to have taken Bread, and having given thanks, to have broken? What is it that he brake? Its non-sence if it*

have

have no accusative case that it respects? And plain Grammatical construction tells us then, that it must be that before mentioned, What he Took he blessed, and brake and gave: But he took Bread and the Cup — The same is in *Mat.* 26, 26, 27. and the other Evangelists.

II. The Scriptures expressly (*Act.* 2, &c.) make the Killing of Christ, and drawing his blood, to be the heinous sin of the Jews, for which some Repented and others were cast off: Therefore it is not to be believed that Christ did first kill or tear himself, and shed his own blood; or that his disciples did kill him, or tear his flesh and shed his blood, before the Jews did it. And if they tore his flesh and drank his blood, and yet killed him not, the event altered not the fact: The Jews did but break his flesh and shed his blood. If you fly to a good intention, Paul will come in for some further excuse for his persecution.

III. 1 COR. 10. 21. *Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of Devils: Ye cannot be partakers of the Lords table and of the table of Devils.* — Here note 1. That the same phrase is used of the Participation of the Lords mysteries and the Devils. But it was not the flesh and blood or the substance of Devils which the Idolaters ever intended to partake of: but only their sacrifices.

2. It is here called only the Table and the Cup, and not the flesh and the blood.

3. It is said that They could not partake of both: whereas according to the Papists doctrine, if a man should partake of the Idols sacrifice in the morning, and of the Lords Table in the evening (without repentance,) he should really partake of Christs own flesh and blood; which the Text saith cannot be done.

P. It meaneth only, You cannot Lawfully, or you ought

ought not to partake of both, but not that it is *impossible* or never done.

R. No doubt but it meaneth that They *ought not*, or *cannot Lawfully*; but thats not all : The text plainly meaneth, *You cannot have communion with both* : You may take the *bread and wine* at your peril ; but you cannot partake of it as a *sacramental feast* which God prepareth you, and so partake of *Christ* therein.

And the same is said ( expounding this ) 2 Cor. 6. 15. *What concord hath Christ with Belial ——— and what agreement hath the temple of God with Idols ?* ] Intimating that Communion with God and Idols, Christ and *Belial*, are ( so far ) inconsistent : But by the Papists doctrine an Idolater and Son of *Belial* may partake of the very *substance of Christs body and blood*, into his body, as verily as he partaketh of his meat and drink.

IV. The Scripture teacheth us expressly to judge of sensible things by sense. Luk. 24. 39. [*Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I my self : handle me, and see ; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feet.* ] And v. 43, [*he did eat before them*] to confirm their faith. But they could have no more sensible evidence of any of this, than we have of the being of *Bread and Wine*, or some sensible substance after Consecration. Joh. 2. 9. *they tasted the water turned into Wine*, and were convinced.

P. But the *Body* of Christ here is not a sensible thing.

R. But *Bread and Wine* are sensible things.

P. But *They* are not *There* ; and so are no objects of sense.

R. But all our senses say that *They* are *there* ; and by them we must judge.

P. Your *senses* perceive nothing but *Accidents* : and your *understanding* must believe God, and so ( as you noted

noted out of *Aquinas* before) there is no deceit either of sense or Intellect.

R. Though this be answered fully before, I will again tell you, That these two notorious falsehoods are all that you have to say against *Humanity* in this case, thats worth the noting. I. It is false that you say that *sense* perceiveth not *substance* : When I take up a staff or stone in my hand, I do not only feel Roughness or Smoothness, &c. but a *substance* : It is a *quantitative*, and *qualitative substance*, which I feel, taste, smell, see and hear : And this I perceive by *sensation* it self, as the medium to the Intellect. It is not the *sense* indeed, but the *Intellect* that giveth it the *Logical notion* or *definition* of a *substance* ; but it is the *sense it self* that by *sensation* perceiveth it ; and to deny this is to deny all sense.

And if it were not so, How could any *such substance* be known ? when it cannot come into the Intellect but by the sense ?

I I. ☞ Your great cheat ( or error ) is by confounding the first and *natural-necessary perception* of a *sensibile sensatum* or *incomplex object*, by the *Intellect*, with the *second conception* of the *Names* of things, or of *Organical* second notions, and the *third conception* of them *Artificially* by the use of these names and *Organical* notions, and the fourth perception of *Consequents* from those conceptions. To know by *Believing* is but the third or fourth sort of knowledge, and presupposeth the two first. If a man had never heard a *name* or *word* in his life ; yet by *sensation* as soon as he saw, smelt, tasted, heard, handled things, his *Intellect* would have had a *perception* of the *Thing it self* as it was *sensate* ; And this is the *Intellects first perception* : And this is it which falleth under our question, *Whether the Intellect in this first perception of a substance or Thing as sensate, be deceived or not*, when the Thing hath the Conditions of

of an object before mentioned. 2. Next this we learn or invent *Names* and *organical notions* for things: And whether these be *true* or *false*, and whether they be *apt* or *inept* is all one. This is but an arbitrary work of art. 3. Next this we conceive of things by the *Means* of these *Names* and *second notions*, and examine the *Congruence*: and *we* define them: And this is but a work of *Artificial Reasoning*, and presupposeth the first *Natural necessary* perception. Now *Faith* belongeth partly to *this*, and partly to the *fourth*, which is The raising of *Conclusions*, and the weaving of *methods*; and presupposeth the first, yea and the second: It is but an assent given by the means of an *Extrinsick Testimony* of God, that this particular *Word* is *True*, &c. Now if the *Intellect* in its *first Perception* (*natural and necessary*) of the *Thing it self*, as *sensate*, be deceived, if *faith* should be contrary to it, 1. It must be such a *Faith* which is the *immediate contrary perception* of a *sensate object*; which is *no faith*, nor is any such possible, (properly called *faith*): 2. And if *faith* can come after and undeceive the *Intellect*, by saying that God *saith* otherwise, yet this would be no *prevention* of its *deception*, but a *cure*, presupposing the said *deception* as the disease to be cured. So that to say as *Aquinas* that *faith preventeth the deceit of the Intellect*, is a *falsehood* contrary to the nature of man, and his natural way of acting, as he is composed of soul and body.

I have said this over again, lest error get advantage by the brevity and unobservedness of that which I said before.



## CHAP. VII.

Argum. 5. *All these miracles have not the least proof; yea, the Scriptures fully direct us to a cross interpretation of the Papists pretended proofs; which also are renounced by themselves.*

I Know of no Scripture proof in the World that the Papists pretend to, but the words, *This is my Body*, and *This is my Blood*, and such like. And that these are no proof I shall fully prove to any impartial man.

I. The very nature of the *Sacrament* instituted by Christ with his expressed *End*, command our Reason to expound the word [is] of *signification*, representation or exhibition, and the word [Body] and [Blood] of a new *Relative form* only, that is, of a *body and blood Representative*, (which is all one in effect): As a piece of *Gold, Silver, or Brass*, is by the law and stamp turned really into the *Kings Current Coin*; and so hath a new *Relative form*: so that you may truly say that there is a change made of the *Gold, or Silver* into the *Kings Coy*n: and it is no more to be called *meer Gold or Silver* (though it be *Gold and Silver* still), because the *form denominateth*, and the new form is now that in question which must denominate. Or as a Prince that is married in *effigie* or by a *Representative* to a woman, is not there personally; and yet it is aptly said, *This is the Prince which is betrothed or married to thee*. Or as we say of Pictures, *This is Peter, or Paul, or John*. Or as when we deliver a man possession of a  
House

/ *House by a Key, or of Land by a twig and a turf, or of a Church by the betrope, &c. and say, Take, this is such a House, or such a piece of Land, or Church, &c. As this is ordinary intelligible speech among all men, so Christ tells them that he would be so understood.*

1. In that his *Real natural body spake this*, of the *Bread and Wine* which was not his natural body : His real natural body was present, visible, entire, unwounded, his blood unpilt, and did eat and drink ( the other, as the Papiſts hold, as being the ſame ) : And can any living man imagine that the Diſciples who underſtood not his Death, Reſurrection, Aſcenſion, &c. yet underſtood by theſe four words, when they ſaw Chriſts body alive and preſent, that this Bread and Wine was that ſame Body and Blood, without any more queſtioning ?

2. In that he bids them, *Do this in Remembrance of him* ; which plainly ſpeaketh a commemorating ſign : Who will ſay at his laſt farewell when he is parting with his friends, *I will ſtay among you, or keep me among you, in Remembrance of me* ? So for Chriſt to ſay, *Eat me in remembrance of me*, were ſtrange.

II. It may put all out of Controverſie to find, that Chriſts words of *one half of the Sacrament* are (as they confeſs) *figurative* ; therefore the other muſt be ſo judged alſo. Luk. 22. 20. *This Cup is the new Teſtament in my blood, which is ſhed for you* : 1 Cor. 11. 25. [*This Cup is the new Teſtament in my blood.*] And here no man denyeth a double Trope at leaſt : no man expoundeth it, that the *Cup* or the *Wine* was the *New Teſtament it ſelf*. And yet it is as expreſſly ſaid, as it is that the *Bread* is the *Body* it ſelf. How then will they prove that one is ſpoken properly, and the other figuratively ?

III. There

III. There is no more found in these words to assert the Bread to be *Christs Body*, than is found in a multitude of such phrases in Scripture asserting things which all men expound otherwise. As in Joh. 15. 1. *I am the Vine and my Father is the husbandman* : Joh. 10. 7, 9. *I am the door* — Joh. 10. 14. *I am the good Shepherd and know my Sheep* : Psal. 22. 6. *I am a worm and no man* (which being a prophesie of Christ, a Heretick imitating you, might deny Christs humanity :) 1 Cor. 10. 4. *That Rock was Christ* — 1 Cor. 12. 27. *Ye are the body of Christ* — Mat. 5. 13, 14. *Ye are the Sals of the earth : Ye are the lights of the World* — Joh. 6. 63. *The words that I speak unto you they are spirit and they are Life*. Abundance such are in the Scripture, as All flesh is grass : Christ is the Lamb of God : the Lyon of the Tribe of Juda ; the bright Morning Star ; the head Corner Stone, &c.

And it is yet more fully satisfactory, that the Hebrew constantly putteth [ *is* ] for [ *signifieth* ] as you may find in all the old Testament ; having no other word so fit to express [ *signifying* ] by : And as Christ spake after that manner, so the New Testament ordinarily imitateth ; As Daniel and the Revelation agree in saying, of the Visions, *This is such or such a thing*, instead of *this signifieth it*. So Christ, *Matth. 13. 21, 22, 23, 37, 38, 39*. He that soweth *is* the Son of man : the field is the world : the good seed are the Children of the Kingdom ; the tares are the children of the wicked one : the enemy is the Devil, the Harvest is the end. The reapers are the Angels — And thus ordinarily.

IV. Yea, the same kind of phrase used before in the Passover, teacheth us how to expound this : Exod. 12. 11. *Ye shall eat it in haste, It is the Lords Passover* —

*Passover* — vers. 27. *It is the sacrifice of the Lords Passover.*

V. Yea the ordinary way and phrase of Christs teaching may yet farther put us out of doubt. For he usually taught by Parables, and expresseth his sense by such assertions: As Matth. 13. 3. *Behold a sower went out to sow, &c.* Luk. 15. 11, 12. *A certain man had two sons, and the younger said, &c.* Luk. 12. 16, *The ground of a certain Rich man, &c.* Luk. 16. 19. *There was a certain Rich man, &c.* Mat. 21. 28. *A certain man had two sons, &c.* Vers. 33. *There was a certain householder which planted a Vineyard, &c.* The Gospel aboundeth with such instances, which teach us how to interpret these words of Christ.

V I. But most certainly all those forementioned texts teach it us, which expressly call it *Bread after the Consecration*. If we will not believe the Holy Ghost himself, who so frequently calleth it *bread*, it is in vain to alledge any text of Scripture in the Controversie.

Now to feign a course of ordinary Miracles, Greater and more than Christs; and this to every Priest; how ignorant and impious soever; to pretend that every Pope and Bishop can for money sell the Holy Ghost or the Gift of Miracles, in Ordination; and all this when no eye seeth the Miracles, when it is confessed that Angels cannot naturally see it, yea when all mens senses perceive the contrary; and all this because, that Christ said *This is my Body*, while abundance such sayings in Scripture, yea the words about the *Cup it self*, are confessed to be tropical, and when the Scripture expressly telleth us that there is *Bread*. Judge whether it be possible for Satan to have put a greater scorn upon the Christian faith, or a greater hindrance

to the Worlds Conversion, than to tell them, you must renounce not only your Humanity but all common sense, if you will be Christians, and be saved, or suffered to enjoy your estates and lives.

VII. Lastly, It is ordinary with their subtlest Schoolmen to confess that this their doctrine of Transubstantiation cannot be proved from Scripture, and that they believe it only because their *Church saith it*, which must be believed, and because that by the same spirit which wrote the Scripture, the *Church is taught* thus to expound it. So that all their faith of this is by them resolved into a phanatick pretence of *Inspiration*; As I have elsewhere shewed out of *Durandus, Paludanus, Scotus, Ockam, Quodl. 6. li. 5. q. 31. Rada vol. 4. Cont. 7. a. 1. pag. 164, 165.*

And no General Council ever determined it till that at *Rome* under *Innoc. 3.* Where saith *Marth. Paris*, many decrees were proposed or brought in by the Pope which some liked and some disliked. And this was 1215 years after Christs birth. And *Stephanus Aduensis* is the first in whom the name of Transubstantiation is found, about the year 1100.

## CHAP. VIII.

Arg. 6. *From the Nature of a Sacrament.*

Arg. 6. **T**Hat Doctrine which by consequence denyeth the Lords Supper to be a true Sacrament, is false.

The Papists doctrine of Transubstantiation by consequence denyeth the Lords Supper to be a true Sacrament: Therefore the Papists doctrine of Transubstantiation is false.

The *Major* I know no man that will deny that we have now to deal with.

The *Minor* needeth no other proof, than the common definition of a Sacrament, and Christs own description of this Sacrament in the Scripture.

I. *Aquinas* concludeth 3. q. 60. a. 1. that a Sacrament is a sign; and a. 2. that it is a sign of a thing sacred as it sanctifieth men; and a. 3. that it is a Rememorative sign of Christs passion, a demonstrative sign of Gods Grace, and a prognosticating sign of future Glory: And a. 4. that it must be *Res sensibilis* a sensible thing, it being natural to man to come to the knowledge of things intelligible by things sensible, and the Sacrament signifieth to man spiritual and intelligible Goods: and a. 5. that they must be things of Divine determination, &c.

But, 1. If the Bread and Wine be gone, there is nothing left to be a sign, a Real sensible sign, to lead us to the knowledge of spiritual and intelligible things. If they say that the *species* of Bread and Wine is the sensible sign, what mean they by that cheating word

[*species*?]

[*species?*] Not the *specifying form* or matter, but only the *outward appearance*. And is it a *true* or a *false* appearance? If *True*, then there is Bread and Wine: If *false*, it is a false sign: And what is that false appearance which God maketh a Sacrament of? It is plainly nothing but the *Accidents* of *Bread* and *Wine* without the substance. But, 1. When they take the Cup from the Laity, and deny them half the Sacrament, sure there are then no *Accidents of Wine*. Is there either *Quantity*, *Colour*, *Smell*, *Taste*, &c. of *Wine*? They will not say it. So that here is no *sensible sign* as to one half.

2. And herein they deal far more inhumanely with us than the Infidels themselves: For when they plead against Christ and Scripture, they grant that the *common principles* and *Notitia*, which all mankind acknowledge, are the *certain unquestionable light of Nature*. But the Papists deny not only the *Notitias communes*, but *common sense*.

See my *More Reasons for the Christian Religion*, and the Lord Herbert de Verulam.

It is nothing with them to damn all the world, that will not believe contradictions. They say that the *Quantity* of *Nothing* endued with the *Qualities*, the *Actions*, the *Passion*, the *Relations*, the *quando*, *ubi*, *situs* of *nothing*, is the *Sacramental sign*. Inhumane contradiction! 1. *Gassendus* and others say truly, that an *Accident* is not properly *Res*, but *Modus Rei*, (*vel Qualitas*, as he calleth it.) 2. *Quantity* doth not Really differ a *re quanta*: and to say, [*The Length, Breadth, Profundity of Nothing*] is a notorious contradiction. And so it is of the other *Accidents*. There is no *Real sensible sign*, and therefore no Sacrament, where there is *nothing*, but the *quantity*, *colour*, *taste*, *smell*, &c. of *Nothing*.

3. And they cannot, they dare not say, that Christs

K

Real



Real Flesh and Blood, is the *Sacramental sign*: For,  
 1. It is not *sensible*; 2. It should be then the *sign*  
*of it self*: The sign and the thing signified cannot be  
 the same.

II. The very *substantiality* or *corporeity* of the  
*Bread and Wine as such*, is part of the *sign*: As Christ  
 saith, *Behold and handle me, a spirit hath not flesh and*  
*blood, as ye see me have*: So he taketh *Corporeal bread*  
*and wine* in their sight, and *breaketh it*, and *poureth it*  
*out*, and *giveth it them* to see, to feel, to taste, to eat,  
 that they may know it is *true bread and wine*, the  
 signs of his True Body and Blood. So that to deny  
 the *Corporeity* is to deny *Christs Corporeity in its signs*;  
 and tendeth to the old Heresie of them that held that  
 Christ had but a *phantastical body*, or was not indeed  
 Crucified, but seemed so to be: They teach Hereticks  
 to argue, *The sign was no Real substance*: Therefore  
*neither the thing signified*.

III. The *nutritive use* of the *bread and wine* was  
 another part of the *sign*, as all confesse: As *bread and*  
*wine* are the *Nutrimēt* of the body and life of man,  
 so is Christ crucified *meritoriously*, and Christ glorified  
*efficiently*, the life of the soul. And he that denyeth  
 the *Nutritive sign*, denyeth the *Sacrament*: But it is  
 not the *false appearance*, or *phantasm*, or *accidents* of  
*bread and wine*, that are the natural *nourishers* of man:  
 Therefore he that denyeth the *nourishing substance*,  
 denyeth the *Real sensible Sacramental sign*.

Saith Bellarmin de *Euchar. l. 3. c. 23*. [*In the Eu-*  
*charist we receive not corporal food that the flesh may*  
*be thence nourished and made fat: but only to signifie*  
*inward refection.*] So that he acknowledgeth this to  
 be part of the *Sacramental sign*. So Gregor. Valent.  
 saith that [*The chief and essential signification of this*  
*Sacrament is that which by external nourishment is*  
*signified*]

signified, the internal spiritual refection of the soul by the body of Christ. ] So that denying the nourishing sign is destroying the essence of the Sacrament.

I V. The breaking of the Bread and pouring out the Wine is confessedly another part of the Sacramental sensible sign. But, 1. When there is no Wine, there is no pouring it out: 2. And if there be no Bread neither, there is no breaking it: Can that be broken which is not? They that deny (as the Papists do) that the Bread is broken (saying that only the Quantity of Nothing is broken) deny the sensible Sacramental sign.

And here I may note, that we do not well to contend with them for denying the Cup only to the Laity, and granting them only the Bread, when indeed they grant neither, but deny them both: There is (say they) no more Bread than Wine, but only a false appearance of it.

V. Lastly, The Apostle 1 Cor. 10. 16, 17. sheweth that one Sacramental use of the Bread was to signifie the Unity of Christians, who are one Bread, and one Body, as one Loaf is made of many Corns. But that cannot be One, which is Nothing: *Ens, Unum & Verum convertuntur*. To say with Greg. Valent. and Bellarmine, that because it was Once bread, and one bread, therefore the accidents of it remaining now signifie that we are one bread, is but to say, that There was once a fit sign, but then there wanted the form: Now after Consecration, there is no Sacramental sign, but yet there is a Sacramental form: And in what Matter is that form? Doubtless it can be no where but in the Brain or Mind of man: That is, man can Remember that once he saw Bread: This is the species of bread in his Intellect: This species is the sign: And so we have found out another sense of the species of bread, than many think on; viz. It is that which is called The spe-

*cles intentionalis*, or the *Idea* or conception of *bread* in a *mans fantasie* and *mind*: And so indeed the Sacrament is with them an *invisible thing*: for it is only in *mens minds*: There is no Sacrament on the *Altar*, but in the *thoughts*: And so who hath a Sacrament, and who not, we know not: And a man may by *thinking* make a Sacrament when he will.

---

## CHAP. IX.

### *Of the Novelty of Transubstantiation.*

**R.** I Once thought to have next proved out of the Current of Antiquity, the Novelty of this inhumane doctrine of the Papists, and that the Antients commonly confessed, that there was true *Bread* and *Wine* remaining in the Sacrament after Consecration: But, 1. I should but tempt and weary ordinary Readers, who neither need any such arguments (having *Sense* and *Scripture* to give them satisfaction) nor are able to try them: For it is an indirect kind of dealing, to expect that the unlearned, or those that are strangers to the Writings of the Antients, should believe this or that to be their mind and sayings, merely because I tell them so. And if they read the plainest words, they know not whether I rightly recite them, but by believing me. And it is as unreasonable on the other side, that the Papists should expect, either by their Citations or their general Affirmations, that the Readers should believe them, that the Antients were for Transubstantiation. Till men can both read the Authors themselves, and try the Copies, they can have no sure historical notice what the Fathers held, except by the

the common consent of credible Reporters or Historians: Not while one side saith, they say this, and the other side saith they say the contrary, and yet their Books are to be seen by all. We may bid them *believe us*, and the Papists may bid them *believe them*, and a Priest may cheat them by saying, that his word is the Churches: But though this will produce a humane belief in the Hearers or Readers, as by advantages it is most taking with them, yet that fallible belief is all the Certainty that it can afford them. Therefore I think it most ingenuous and reasonable to give men such arguments as they are capable of understanding and improving to certain satisfaction.

2. Because they that can study such Authors as have gathered the sentences of the Antients in this Controversie, may find it so fully done by *Edmund. Albertinus* in his second Book, that they can need no more.

P. You know that *Albertinus* is answered.

R. And I know that he is again Defended: And who doubteth but you can answer me copiously, if I did maintain that the Sun giveth light: What is it that a man cannot talk for? especially they that can hope to perswade all the Christian world, that they must be damned, unless they will believe that all mens senses are deceived, and that God is the great Deceiver of the world.

P. But how can you think to please God and be saved, if you be not of the same faith as the Church hath alwayes been of? All the antient Fathers and Catholick Church were for Transubstantiation; and are you wiser and in a safer way than they?

R. You have lost your credit with me so far, as that your word is no oracle to me: If I must not believe my own nor other mens senses, I am not bound to believe you: at least when I know you speak falsely.

But I pray tell me, How know you that the Church and Fathers did so believe ?

P. Because the present Church saith so; which cannot err.

R. Do not your own Writers say, that a General Council and Pope may err in matter of fact ? and that they did so in Condemning Pope *Honorius* and in other Cases ?

P. Yes : but this is a matter of faith.

R. Is it not a matter of fact, what this or that man said, and what doctrine the Church at such a time did teach and hold ?

But how know you that the present Church doth say so, that this was the faith of the antient Church ?

P. By their testimony in a General Council.

R. Did you hear the Council say so ?

P. No : but the Church telleth me that the Council said so.

R. Who is it that you now call the Church which tells you so ?

P. My Superiours, who have it from the Pope, and their Fathers.

R. Are your Superiours that told you so, the Church ? Or is the Pope the Church ? If so, What need you say a Council is the Church ? And how know you that the Pope and your Superiours err not in a matter of fact ?

P. I know it by the Decrees of the Council yet extant.

R. 1. But if *sense* be deceitful, how know you that you ever read such Decrees ? 2. How know you that they are not forgeries, or since corrupted ?

P. The Church is a safe keeper of its own Records.

R. Still

R. Still what mean you by the Church? The Vulgar neither keep nor understand your Councils. The Council of *Trent* is long ceased: No other General Council hath been since, to tell you what are the true Decrees of that Council. The Pope is not the Church: And he may err in a matter of fact: What then is the Church that tells you certainly what the Council of *Trent* decreed? Tell me if you can.

P. We have such common historical Evidence and Tradition, as you have for your Acts of Parliament when the Parliament is ended. The present Governours preserve them.

R. Very good: It is the Office of the Governours to take that Care, but therein they are not indefectible and infallible; but *they* and the *published Laws*, and the *notice of the whole Land*, and the *Judicial proceedings* by them in the *Courts of Judicature* make up a *Certain Historical Evidence*. And so it may be in your Case: And when you have talkt your utmost, you can shew no more. And have not *we* the same Writings of Fathers and Councils as *you* have? You dare not deny it. Why then may not *we* know what is in them as well as *you*? And I pray you tell me, Whether your Antiquaries, such as *Albaspinus*, *Sixtus Senensis*, *Petavius*, *Sirmondus*, &c. do prove what *Cyprian*, *Optatus*, *Augustine*, &c. held, by the judgement of the Pope or Councils, or by citing the words of the Authors themselves? And do *Crab*, *Binnius*, *Sutrius*, *Caranza*, &c. prove what one Council said by the authority of another, or by the *Records* themselves, yet visible to all?

P. Those Records themselves, even the visible Writings of the Fathers and Councils are for Transubstantiation,

R. Till you have perswaded me out of my senses, I will not believe you. I pray you tell me if you can of

any Author or Council that ever used the name [ Transubstantiation ] before *Stephanus Adnensis* after the year 1100, *de Sacram. Altar. c. 13.*

*P.* Though the name be new, the Doctrine is not.

*R.* Tell me next, what *General Council* did ever determine it, before the Council of *Laterane* under *Innoc. 3. an. 1215.*

*P.* Not expressly : for *General Councils* need not mention it, till the *Albigenses* Hereticks gave them occasion by denying it.

*R.* Was it an Article of faith before ? If it were, either the Councils are not the measure of your faith, or it is very mutable.

*P.* Among all your questionings answer me this question if you can. If that *General Council* decreed Transubstantiation, what could move them so to do, if it were not the faith of the Church before ? Were they not all of the same mind the day before they did it ? and so the day before that, and the day before that, &c. Or do you think that they were against Transubstantiation the night before, and awaked all of another mind the next morning ? What could make all the Pastors of the Church think that this was the true faith, if they did not think it was the antient faith ? And what could make them think it the antient faith, if it were not so ? Did not they know what their Fathers held ? And did not their Fathers know what their Fathers held ? The same I say of the Council of *Trent* also.

*R.* Thus men that must not believe the common sense of mankind, can believe the dreaming conjectures of their brains, and sit in a corner, and thence tell the world what can and what cannot be done by publick assemblies, at many hundred years and miles distance. Who would not laugh at a Fryer, that in his Cell would tell by moral conjectures, all the thoughts and motions of an Army  
or



or Navy, that never saw them, and contrary to the experience of those that were on the ground and interested in their Councils and actions. Observe how many false suppositions go to make up your cheats.

1. You suppose this a true *General Council*, which is a pack of factious Prelates subject to the Pope, and assembled at *Rome* in his own Palace, under the awe of his presence and power. And as if the small number after at *Trent* had spake the minds of all the Churches.

2. You suppose all the members of a Council to be of one mind; when as they determine by the *Major Vote*. And oft times the difference is not above two or three, and its possible one Voice may turn the scales: And perhaps one, or two, or ten may be absent one day, and present another, and so the Cry of [ *the Judgement of all the Bishops in the world* ] may signifie no more, but that two or three of the other side staid a little too long at dinner that day, while the other party carryed it by their absence. And I pray you where hath God promised, that the faith of an hundred and one shall not fail, when the faith of ninety nine of the same company may fail (supposing the Council to be two hundred): Or why are the one hundred and one the Bishops of all the world, and not the ninety nine?

3. Do you think we never read the History of the Council of *Trent*? and before them, of the Councils of *Ariminum*, *Ephes.* 2, yea, *Calcedon*, &c.? And yet must we suppose, that men come thither all of one mind? when they have such shameful Contentions? Such cunning contrivances to get the majority of Votes? Such awe and terror from the power of the Chief? and such carnal dependances and respects to their several worldly interests? Yea, sometimes fighting it out unto blood (as *Dioscorus* and *Flavianus* case doth shamefully evince?)

4. And

4. And must we suppose mens minds to be *changed in their sleep*, when the *awe* or the *oratory* of other men change them? Do we not know the Course of the *Parliaments* of *England* of later times? How much a few men of more than ordinary parts and interest, can do with the rest? And how oft the major Vote hath gone against the sense of the far greater number of the House?

5. And do we not know, that ordinarily he that is sent to the Council from a Province, is chosen as it pleaseth the Pope, the King, or the Archbishop, or some in greatest power; and rarely according to the free-will and sense of the greater part of the Clergy. If five hundred to one of the Clergy of a Kingdom be of one mind, and the Prince, or chief men, or powerfullest Prelates be of another, they will send a Bishop thither of their own mind.

6. Do you think we know not that all the Papists are not past the third or fourth part of the Christian world? Why then should their sense be called the sense of all the Christian world?

7. Do you think we know not how little reason you have to say, that the Council at *Laterane* spake the sense of all the Church? When the Decrees were but proposed by Pope *Innocent*, and recited there without any due Synodical deliberation, and some liked them, and some disliked them? as you may find in *Math, Paris* in *K. John*, *Naucerus Gener.* 41. *ad an.* 1215. *Godfridus ad an.* 1215. *Platina in Vita Innoc.* 3. And this one of your late false Scriblers in a Book for Toleration also saith; Though the Disputers against Dr. *Gunning* and Dr. *Pierſon* copiously and confidently justify that Council: and indeed with you it passeth for an Approved one.

8. And were not your arguing as strong for the Council of *Ephes*, 2, and that at *Arim*, and *Sirmium*, and divers at *Constantinople* disallowed, and those at *Constance* and *Basil*, (where were many times the number of the Council at *Trent*)? Did these Councils all go to bed of one mind, and rise of another? Or did they not know what their Fathers faith was? Why then do you reprobate them, and deny that which they decreed as of faith? Is it not a shame, to talk of [the *Bishops of all the world*] and [Tradition from their Fathers] when your meaning is but that *All these may err*, and *do oft err*, unless *one man*, the *Pope* approve them? But where *sense* is renounced, we must not expect *modesty*.

P. But the antient Councils and Fathers are against you, as is to be seen.

R. It is utterly false: I will not abuse the Reader so as to carry him into a Wood, and lose him among a multitude of old Books, when he hath more satisfactory evidence enough at hand.

But, I. As to all your Citations from true antiquity (for your forged Authors and corrupted Testimonies we regard not) they are answered by this one true observation, that when old Writers sometimes say, that after consecration it is [No more bread and wine, but the body and blood of Christ], their whole Context plainly sheweth, that they mean that it is no more *MEER* or *Common Bread and Wine*; and usually they so speak. Because *forma denominat*, and it is the *ultimate form* that denominateth, all antecedent forms being but the *dispositio materia*. As if the question be, *Whether a Shilling be Silver or Money?* Before the Coining, it was *but Silver*; but after, it is no more *Common Silver*, but *Money*: *Silver* is but the *matter*, and not the denominating form. Is your Garment to be called *Cloth*,  
or

or a *Cloak*? Before the making it was but *Cloth*, but now it is not meer *Cloth*, but a *Cloak*. The same I may say of the Kings Crown and Scepter, or of any *Relative, Representative* or *Personating* form that is added to any matter or man. This is the plain meaning of the Antients.

II. And as to what they say against you, I will now only give you a few brief instances.

1. *Iustin Martyr. in Dial. cum Tryph. saith, [The offering of Flower delivered to be offered for them that were cleansed of the Leprosie, was a Type of the BREAD of the Eucharist which our Lord Jesus Christ commanded us to make in remembrance of his passion, &c.]*

And more plainly *Apolog. 2. (indeed the first)* [When the President hath given thanks, and all the people acclaimed, those that with us are called Deacons, distribute to every one present BREAD and WINE and Water, and bring them to those that are absent.]

2. *Irenaus saith lib. 4. c. 34. [For as the Bread which is of the Earth receiving the divine invocation, is not now Common Bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things, the Terrene and the Celestial, &c.]*

See more out of him in *Albertinus*, at large.

3. *Tertullian cont. Marcion l. 3. c. 19, [Calling Bread his Body, that hence you may understand that he gave to Bread the Figure of his body.]*

And before l. 1. [He reprobated not ——— Bread, by which he Representeth his very Body.]

And lib. 4. cap. 40. [The Bread which he took and distributed to his Disciples he made his body, saying, This is my Body; that is, The figure of my body. — And what he would have Bread then signifie, he sufficiently declared, calling Bread his Body.]

And it is a notable passage of *Tertullians* against the Academicks that questioned sense, lib. de anim. c. 17.

[ What dost thou, O procacious Academick? Thou overthrowest the whole state of life: Thou disturbest the whole order of nature; Thou blindest the providence of God himself; as if he had made mens lying and deceitful senses to be the Lords, in understanding, honouring, dispensing and enjoying all his works: Is not the whole Condition ( of man ) subadministrated by these. ]

And after [ We may not call those senses into question, lest Christ himself must deliberate of their certainty ( or must distrust them ). Lest it may be said, that he falsely saw Satan cast down from Heaven, or falsely heard the voyce of his Father testifying of him; or was deceived when he touched Peters Wives Mother ——— or perceived not a true taste of the Wine which he Consecrated. in the memorial of his blood. ] Many such places are in *Tertullian*.

4. *Origen* is large and plain to the same purpose in *Matth. 25.* calling it [ Bread and a Typical and Symbolical Body, which profiteth none but the worthy receivers, and that according to the proportion of their faith, and which no wicked man doth eat, &c. ] Many more such places *Albertinus* vindicateth.

5. *Cyprians* Epistle to *Magnus* is too large this way to be recited. As [ Even the Sacrifices of the Lord declare the Christian Unanimity, connexed by firm and inseparable love: For when the Lord calleth Bread his body ( or his body bread ) made up of many united grains, &c. And when he calleth the Wine his Blood, &c. ] So Epist. ad *Cecil.*

6. *Eusebius* *Cesar.* demonstr. *Evang. l. 1. c. 10.* [ Celebrating daily the memorial of the body and blood of Christ ] ——— [ Seeing then we receive the memorial of this Sacrifice to be perfected on the Table, by the symbols

bols of his body and most precious blood——] And  
 l. 8. [He delivered to us to use, Bread as the symbol  
 of his own body.]

7. Athanasius's words are recited by Albertinus l. 2.  
 p. 400, 401, &c.

8. Basil. de Spir. Sanct. saith, [Which of the Saints  
 hath left us in Writing the words of invocation,  
 when the Bread of the Eucharist, and the Cup of blef-  
 sing are shewed?]

9. Ephrem (in Biblioth. Photii p. 425. Edit. August.)  
 saith, [The body of Christ, which believers receive,  
 loseth not his sensible substance, and is not separated  
 from the intelligible grace.]

And ad eos qui filii Dei, &c. [Take notice diligen-  
 tly how taking Bread in his hands, he blessed it, and  
 brake it, for a figure of his immaculate body, and he  
 blessed the Cup and gave it to his Disciples as a figure  
 of his pretious blood.]

10. Cyrillus (vel. Johan.) Hierosol. Catech. My-  
 stag. calls the bread indeed Christs body, but fully ex-  
 pounds himself de Chrysmate, Cat. 3. pag. 235. [For as  
 the Bread of the Eucharist, after the invocation of the  
 Holy Ghost, is no more Common Bread, but is the Body  
 of Christ: So also this Holy Oyntment is no more meer  
 Oyntment, nor (if any one had rather so speak) com-  
 mon, now it is consecrated; but it is a Gift (or Grace)  
 which causeth the presence of Christ and the Holy  
 Ghost; that is, of his Divinity.] As the Oyntment is  
 Grace, or the Holy Ghost, just so the Bread is the body  
 of Christ, as he saith after Cat. 4. It is not only what we  
 see (Bread and Wine) but more.

11. Hierom cont. Jovinian. l. 2. The Lord as a type  
 (or figure) of his blood, offered not water but wine.

12. Ambrose de Sacram. l. 4. c. 4. [This therefore  
 we asserr, How that which is Bread, can yet be the body  
 of

of Christ. ] ——— And [ If Christs speech had so much force, that it made that begin to be which was not, how much more is it operative, that the things that were, both Be, and be changed into something else. ] And [ As thou hast drunk the similitude of death, so thou drinkest the similitude of precious blood. ]

13. Theodoret in Dialog. Immutab. dealeth with an Eutychian Heretick, who defended his Error by pleading that the bread in the Eucharist was changed into the body of Christ : To whom saith Theodoret, [ The Lord who hath called that meat and bread which is naturally his Body, and who again called himself a Vine, did honour the visible signs with the appellation of his body and blood; not having changed their Nature, but added Grace to Nature. ]

And in Dialog. 2. In confus. he saith, [ The divine Mysteries are signs of the true body. ] And again, answering the Eutychians pretence of a change he saith, [ By the net which thou hast made, art thou taken. ¶ For even after the Consecration, the Mystical signs change not their nature: For they remain in all their first SUBSTANCE, figure and form, and are Visible, and to be Handled as before. But they are understood to be the things which they were made, and are believed and venerated as made that which they are believed to be. ] Would you have plainer words?

14. Gelasius contr. Nest. & Eutych. saith, [ Verily the Sacraments of the body and blood of Christ which we take, is a Divine thing, for which and by which we are made partakers of the divine nature. ¶ And yet it ceaseth not to be the Substance and Nature of Bread and Wine. And certainly the Image and similitude of the body and blood of Christ are celebrated in the action of the Mysteries. ] What can be plainer?



15. Cyril. Alexandr. in John 4. cap. 14. saith, [ *He gave to his believing disciples fragments of Bread, saying, Take, Eat, This is my body.* ]

16. Faunndus lib. 9. cap. 5. pag. 404. ( as cited by P. Molin. de Novitate Papismi ) [ *We call that the body and blood of Christ which is the Sacrament of his body, in the consecrated Bread and Cup. Not that the Bread is properly his body, and the Cup his blood ; but because they contain the Mysterie of his body and blood.* ]

But I am so weary of these needless Transcriptions, that I will trouble my self and the Reader with no more. *Albertinus* will give him enow more who desireth them : And no doubt but with a wet finger they can blot out all these, and teach us to deny the *sense of words*, as well as our senses.

D. But you said also, that the *Present Church and its Tradition is against Transubstantiation*, as well as the *Antient* : How prove you that ?

R. Just as I prove that the Protestants are against it.

By the *present Church*, I mean the far greater part of all the Christians in the world. The Greeks with the Muscovites, the Armenians, the Syrians, the Copties, the Abassines, and the Protestants, and all the rest who make up about twice or thrice as many as the Papists.

That they hold that there is *true Bread and Wine after Consecration*, all impartial Historians testifie, both Papists and Protestants, and their own several Countrey-men ; and also Travellers who have been among them. And their Liturgies, even those that are in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* put out by themselves, do testifie for those Countreys where they are used ( Though a Bishop *Usher* hath detected ) by one words addition they have shamelessly endeavoured to corrupt the Ethi-

opie

opick Liturgy about the *Real presence.*) But I need no more proof of that which no faithful History doth deny.

And then I need not prove, that Transubstantiation is against the most General or Common Tradition. For all these Christians, the Greeks, Armenians, Abassines, &c. profess to follow the Religion which they have received from their Ancestors, as well as the Papists do: And if the Papists be to be believed in saying that this is the Religion which they received from their forefathers, Why are not the other to be believed in the same case? And if the Popish Tradition seem regardable to them, Why should not the Tradition of twice or thrice as many Christians be more regardable? And if in *Councils*, the Major Vote must carry it; Why not in the Judgement and Tradition of the Real body of Christs Church? As for their trick of excepting against them as Schismatics and Hereticks, to invalidate their Votes and Judgement, we despise it, as knowing that to any Usurper that would make himself the sole Judge, may say by all the rest of the world: But as they judge of others, they are justly judged by others themselves.

CHAP.

## CHAP. X.

*The second part of the Controversie; Whether it be Christs very Flesh and Blood into which the Bread and Wine are Transubstantiated.*

R. **O**ur first Question was, *Whether there be any Bread and Wine left after Consecration*; Our second is, *Whether Christs Real Flesh and Blood be there, as that into which the Bread and Wine are changed?*

And herein 1. I do freely grant, that the change of Christs Body by Glorification is so great, as that it may be called, though not a Spirit, yet a *spiritual body*, as *Paul*, 1 Cor. 15. saith *Ours* when Glorified shall be; that is, A body very like in purity, simplicity, and activity to a Spirit: And the general difference between a spirit and body was not held by many of the Greek Fathers as it is by us: And if the second Council of Nice was Infalible, no Angel or other Creature is *Incorporeal*: Or as *Damasus* saith, [They are Corporeal in respect to God, but Incorporeal in respect to gross bodies.] The perfect knowledge of the difference between *Corpus* and *Spiritus*, except by the *formal Virtues*, is unknown to mortal men.

2. I grant therefore, that our senses are no Competent Judges, *Whether Christs true body be in the Sacrament?* no more than Whether an Angel be in this room? There are bodies which are Invisible.

3. I grant that it is unknown to us, how far Christs Glorified body may extend? Whether the same may be both in Heaven and on earth? I am not able nor willing  
to

to confute them that say, *Light* is a *Body*; nor them that say, It is a *spirit*: nor them that say, It is *quid*, *medium* as a *nexus* of both: I mean *Aether* or *Ignis*, visible in its *Light*. And it is an incomprehensible wonder, if *Lumen* be a real *radiant* or *Emanant* part of the *Sun*, that it should indivisibly fill all the space thence to this earth, and how much further little do we know. So for the extensions of *Christs* body, let those that understand it dispute for me.

4. And I will grant that it is very probable that as in *Heaven* we shall have both a *Soul* and *Body*, so the *Body* is not like to have so near an *Intuition* and *fruition* of *God* as the *soul*. And whether the *Glorified Body* of *Christ* will not be there a *medium* of *Gods* Communication of *Glory* to our *bodies*, yea and his *glorified soul* to our *souls*, as the *Sun* is now to our eyes, I do not well understand: only I know that it is his prayer and will, that we be with him where he is to behold his *Glory*; and that *God* and the *Lamb* will be the *Light* of the *Heavenly Jerusalem*.

5. And I am fully satisfied that it is not the signs only; but the *Real Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*, which are given us in the *Sacraments* (both *Baptism* and the *Eucharist*). But how given us? *Relatively, de jure*; as a man is Given to a *Woman* in *Marriage*; or as a house and land are delivered to me, to be mine for my use; though I touch them not. Thus 1. A right to *Christ* is given us: 2. And the *fruits* or *benefits* of his *Crucified body* and shed blood, are actually given us, that is, *Pardon* and the *Spirit*, merited for us thereby.

6. And among the *Benefits* given us, besides the *Relative*, there are some such as we call *Real* or *Physical* terminatively, and *hyperphysical* originally ut à *Causa*, which are the *spirit* of *Holiness*, or the *Quickening*, *Illuminating* and *Sanctifying* influence of the *spirit* of *Christ*

Christ upon our souls. And the Sacrament is appointed as a special means of communicating this.

7. I have met with some of late who say, that Indeed Christs Body and Blood in his humbled state, were not really eaten and drunk by the disciples, at his last supper: For the *flesh* profiteth not to such a *use*: But that his *Glorified Body* is *spiritual*, and is extensively communicated, and invisibly present under the form of Bread in the Sacrament; and that as we have a *Body*, a *sensitive life*, and an *Intellectual soul*, so Christ is the life of all these respectively; viz. His *Body* is made the *spiritual nourishment of our Bodies*; his *sensitive soul* (for which the word *Blood* is put, because it is in the blood in animals) is the food or life of our sensitive souls; and his *Intellectual soul*, of ours: And to these uses they assert the *Real presence* and *oral* participation of Christs *Glorified body*.

To all which I say, 1. Whether or how far an invisible spiritual Body is *present*, sense is no judge; nor can we know any further than Gods word telleth us. 2. That Christ in his *Glorified soul and Body* is our Intercessour with God, through whom we have all things, we must not doubt. 3. That Christ in his *Humane and Divine Nature* now in Heaven, is that Teacher who hath left us a certain word, and that King who hath left us a perfect Law of Life, whom we must obey, and a promise which we must trust, we must not question. 4. That the Holy Ghost who is our spiritual Life, is given us by, from and for Christ our Mediator, we must take for certain truth.

But, though in all these respects, Faith apprehendeth and liveth upon Christ, yet that moreover his *Glorified Body* in substance, either feedeth or by contact purifieth our Bodies, and his sensitive soul, our sensitive souls, and his Intellectual soul, our Intellectual souls, as if in  
them-

*themselves*, and not in their effects only they were thus communicated to us, I understand not, either by any just conception of the thing it self, or any proof of it from the word of God. But if any can help me to see it, I shall not refuse instruction.

Nor can I see why the *soul* of Christ should be said to be given in the *Wine only*, and not in the *Bread*; Nor why by this kind of Communication he may not as truly be said to be given us in other Ordinances as in the Eucharist: Nor know I what they mean by the *Forms* of *bread* and *wine*, under which they say that Christs Body and blood is given: But I am past doubt that *Bread* and *Wine* are still really in substance there.

And whereas the same men say that It is Christs humbled flesh and blood as sacrificed on the Cross that is *Commemorated*, but his *Glorified Body* and *soul* only which are *Communicated* and *Received*, I must say,  
1. That Christ plainly tells us of his *Giving us his Sacrificed Body* or *flesh* it self to eat, as he is the *Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the World*: And he saith, *Take, Eat, this is my Body which is broken for you*, &c. so that the same body is *Commemorated* and *Communicated*: But *how Communicated*? In the *effects* of his sacrifice: His *Body* was given a *sacrifice* to God for us, and the *fruits* of that sacrifice given to us. And thus he was given a sacrifice for the *life of the world*; And thus we do receive him: By our bodily taking and eating the Bread, we profess that our souls take him to be our Saviour and Cause of our Life, both as *Purchasing* and *Meriting* it on Earth, and *Interceding* and *Communicating* it in and from Heaven.

2. And this Doctrine will not serve the Papists turn, who tell us that *Bread* and *Wine* are ceased, and that Christs very flesh and blood is there, into which all the

substance of the bread and wine are turned ; and that his natural Body before his death, was in the same sort given under the forms of Bread and Wine as now ; and will not be beholden to this subterfuge.

And indeed it is strange if the Sacrament at the *first Institution* should be *One thing*, and ever after another thing ; and that the *Bread* should ever since be turned into *Christs body*, upon the Priests Consecration, and not be turned into it, (because not yet glorified) upon his own words [*This is my Body.*] Therefore we must let this go, and speak of what they own and hold indeed.

And as for any other *Bodily presence, influence or communication* of Christs Body or Soul, besides that which they call *Transubstantiation*, we have nothing to do with it in this Controversie.

That the substance of the *Bread and Wine* is not turned into the substance of the *flesh and blood* of Christ, is proved.

I. Because the Glorified Body of Christ is not formally and properly *Flesh and Blood*: Though it be the same Body which was *Flesh and Blood*. The Apostle Paul saith, 1 Cor. 15. 50, 51. [*Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God; nor doth corruption inherit incorruption; Behold, I shew you a mysterie: We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed.*] It is not only Dr. Hammond, but other of the best expositors who shew that by *Flesh and blood and corruption* here is not meant *sin*, but *flesh and blood formally considered*; which is ever corruptible: And the Papists commonly confess this. If therefore it be *flesh and blood* which the *bread and wine* are turned into, then either Christ hath two bodies, or two parts of one, which are utterly heterogeneous, one *flesh and blood*, and the other not; one corruptible and the other incorruptible.

II. And this feigneth Christ to be often Incarnate, even



even thousands and millions of times ; And to lay down that Incarnate body again as oft as it corrupteth, and to take up a new one as oft as the Priest please ; and yet all but one. Whereas the Church and Scripture have ever told us but of *one Incarnation* of Jesus Christ.

III. And it is expressly contrary to his promise Job. 6. 51. *I am the living bread which came down from heaven : If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever : And the bread which I give is my flesh which I will give for the life of the world*—— v. 34. *Who so eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life*—— *He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that Eateth me, even he shall live by me*—— *He that eateth of this bread shall live for ever*——.] These are the exprefs promises of Christ. But the Papiſts ſay that *wicked men and unbelievers eat the fleſh of Chriſt*, who ſhall not live for ever, nor have eternal life, nor dwell in Chriſt, but are more miſerable by their hypo-criſie.

I paſs by abundance of other arguments, becauſe commonly uſed, and theſe are as many as my ends require ; and I would make the Reader no more work than needs.

CHAP. XI.

*The Conclusion of the first Book: The Causes of Popery.*

R. I Have now made plain to you, 1. *What the Protestant Religion is*, (or at least *my own*, and all that I perswade you or any other to embrace.) 2. And also that it is granted to be all true by the generality of the Papists (as is explained and proved.) 3. And I have told you, by an enumeration of some particulars, why I am not a Papist, and why I do dissuade you from it. 4. And I have made good my first charge, in the point of Transubstantiation, if any thing in the world can be proved. The second I shall leave till another time, viz. To shew you how far their Religion (as Popish) is from Infallible Certainty; and what horrid confusion is among them; and how they have done much to promote Infidelity in the world, by building Religion upon some notorious untruths, and upon a multitude of utter uncertainties. Though I doubt not but among them there are many true Christians, who practically resolve their faith into the surer evidences of Divine Revelation, yet I shall clearly prove to you, that all those whose practical faith is no surer or better, than the notional opinions of their Divines will allow, have no certain faith or Religion at all: And what impudency is it to make men believe, that there is no certainty of Religion to be had, but in their way, who build their Religion upon such a multitude of uncertainties and certain falsehoods, as will amaze you when I come to open them to you, viz. that ever so many

many Learned men, and persons of all ranks, can be induced so to jest in the matters of their salvation.

And if I be not by death or other greater work prevented, I hope in order to make good all the rest of the Charges before mentioned, which are our Reasons against the Popish way of Religion. In the mean time tell me what you think of that which is already said.

D. I know not how to confute what you have said: And yet when I hear them on the other side, methinks their tale seems fair, and I cannot answer them neither; so that between you both, we that are unlearned are in a sad case, who must thus be tost up and down by the disputations of disagreeing Priests, so that we know not what a man may say is certain.

R. To this I have several things to say; 1. *Ordination* doth not make men *wise, holy, humble and self-denying*; but sets such men apart for the sacred office, who seek it, and have tolerable gifts of utterance: And it is too ordinary for worldly minded men, to make a worldly trade of the Priesthood, meerly for *ease, and wealth, and honour*. In which case, do you not think that the Papists who have multitudes of rich benefices, prelaties, preferments, and Church-power, and worldly honour, are liker to be drawn by worldly interest, than such as I that am exceeding glad and thankful, if I might but preach for nothing?

2. Do you lay your faith and salvation upon plausible discourses? and will you be of that mans faith, whom you cannot confute? Then you must be of *every mans* faith: or indeed of *no mans*. There are none of all these sects, so hardly confuted, as a *Porphyry*, a *Julian* or such like *Infidels* who dispute against *Christ*, and the *truth of the Scriptures*? or such *Sadducees* as dispute against the *Immortality of the soul*. Alas, the rattle of Papists, Pelagians, Antinomians, Separatists, Quakers, and

and all such, supposing the truth of the *Souls Immortality* and the *Scriptures*, is easily resisted and confuted, in comparison of their assaults who deny these our foundations. And will you turn Sadducee, Atheist or Infidel because you cannot confute their Sophistry? I tell you, if you knew how much harder it is, to deal with one of these than with a Papist or any other Sectary, you would shake the head, to hear one man dispute for an universal Monarch, and another dispute against a form of prayer, and another whether it be lawful to Communicate with dissenters, &c. while so few of them all can defend their foundations, even the *Souls Immortality* and the *Scriptures*, nor confute a subtle Infidel or Sadducee.

3. What if we *all agreed* to say that there is no Bread in the Sacrament after Consecration? Were it ever the truer for that? Will you be deceived as oft as men can but *agree* to deceive you? There is a far greater party Agreed against Jesus Christ (even five parts of the World) than that which is agreed for him: Will you therefore be against Christ too? There are more Agreed for *Mahomet* (a gross upstart deceiver) than are agreed for Christ: And doth that make it certain that they are in the right?

4. Will you deny all your senses, and the senses of all the World, as oft as you cannot answer him that denyeth them? Upon these terms, what end will there be of any Controversie, or what evidence shall ever satisfie man? Have Papists any surer and more satisfying evidence for you, than sense?

I pray you tell me; Did you ever meet with any of them that doubt of *another life*, or of the *Immortality* of the soul?

D. Yes, many a one: I would we were all more certain than we are,

R. And

R. And what is it that such men would have to put them out of doubt?

D. They say that our talk of Prophets and supernatural revelation are all uncertainties; and if they could see, they would believe. Could they see such *Miracles* as they read of: Had they seen *Lazarus* raised, or Christ risen from the dead, &c. Had they seen Angels or Devils or Spirits appearing: Had they seen Heaven or Hell, they would believe.

R. And are not you more obstinate than they, if you will not believe that there is any *Bread* and *Wine*, when you see, feel, smell, and taste it; and all men that have senses are of the same mind? What is left to satisfy you, if you give so little credit to the common sense of all the world?

D. But I oft think that the *faith* of all the Church is much surer than my sense, or my private faith: At least it is safest to venture in the common road, and to speed as the Church speedeth, which Christ died for, and is his Spouse.

R. 1. But do you think that the opinion of the Papal faction who are not the third part of the Universal Church, that is, the Christian world, is the *faith* of all the Church? Why call you *Opinion* *faith*? and a sect and faction, *All the Church*?

2. Indeed if all the Church did set their *senses* against mine, I would rather believe them than my senses: For I should think, that I were in that point distracted, or my senses by some disease perverted, which I did not perceive: I mean if it were in a case where they had the affirmative: As if all *England* should witness that they saw it Light at Midnight, I would think my eyes had some impediment which I knew not of, if I saw none. But this is not your case; The Papists themselves do not set all their *senses* against yours:

yours : much less the senses of all mankind : They do not say, that [*We and all men, except the Protestants, do see, and feel, and taste that There is no Bread and Wine.*] But contrarily, You have the senses of all the world, and the faith of two or three parts of the Christian world, against the Opinion of one Sect, which Schismatically call themselves All the Church.

D. But suppose that they err in this one point, they may for all that be in the right in all the rest : Who is it that hath no error ? I must not for this one forsake them.

R. 1. I will stand to their own judgements in this, Whether all their foundation and faith be not uncertain, if any one Article of their faith prove false ? They are all (that ever I knew) agreed of the affirmative : And will give you no thanks for such a defence.

2. And if we come to that work, I shall prove all the rest of their opinions before mentioned to be also false.

D. What then if I find but one point false in the Protestants Religion ? Must I therefore forsake it all as false ?

R. 1. Still remember to distinguish between our *Objective* and our *Subjective faith* : or if you understand not those words, between *Gods Revelation* and *Mans Belief* of it : or the *Divine Rule* and *Matter* of our faith, and our faith it self. And about our own *Belief* you must distinguish between a mans *Profession* of *Belief*, and the *Reality* of his belief.

All true Protestants profess to take Gods word alone, or his Revelation in *Nature* and *Scripture*, for the whole *Matter* of their Divine Belief and Religion. But who it is that *sincerely believeth* little do I know : nor how much of this word any singular person understandeth, and believeth, I can give you no account of.

If

If *personal faith* were that which we dispute of, I would be accountable for no mans but mine own. In this sense, There are as many *Faiths* and *Religions* as men: For every man hath his *Own Faith* and *Religion*: And if you know that a man erreth in one point, it followeth not that he erreth in another. They that believed that the *Resurrection* was past, believed a falshood: and yet truly believed that *Christ was the Messiah*: They erred that thought it lawful to eat things offered to *Idols*, and yet they erred not in believing in *Christ*. No two men in the world, its like, have the same degree of *personal faith* and knowledge, as I oft said before. But if our professed *object of faith*, that is, *Gods word*, were false in one thing, we could not be sure that it were true in any thing.

Yet here I told you before, 1. That a man may be much surer that one part of Scripture is *Gods word*, than another; because some Copies are doubtful in the diverse Readings of some particular words or sentences; and which of them that so differ is *Gods word*, we oft know not: But so much as we are sure is the word of God, we are sure is true: So if the Authority of some few books was once doubted of, (as 2 Per. Jam. Jud. Heb. &c.) and yet be by any, it followeth not that they doubt of the truth of any, which they know to be the word of God. 2. Or if any do hold that the Penmen might be left to their natural fallibility in some by historical circumstances or words, it would not follow, that one Article of the Gospel or *Christian faith* is doubtful, which is plainly as the Kernel of it, delivered in all the Scripture, and also by infallible Universal Tradition, by it self, in the Sacrament, Creed, Lords Prayer and Decalogue.

And



And our case also much differeth from the Papists in this: For We profess that our *objective faith*, (Gods word) is *Infallible*, and we are *Infallible* so far as we believe it: But we confess that we are lyable to *misunderstand* some parts of it; and so far are fallible, as being imperfect: But the Papists say, that their *Pope* and *Councils* and *Universal-Practicers* are personally *Infallible*, so as not to be lyable to any misunderstanding of any Article of faith (say some) or Article of *Catholick faith* (say others): And so they make their own Act of *Believing* to be Commensurate and equally certain with Gods word of faith; and therefore they allow you to question them in all, if they err in one, as pretending to a gift of never erring in any.

D. But is it not a great reason to incline us to them rather than to you, when They only pretend to *Infallibility*, and You confess that you are all fallible in your *Belief*?

R. This is to be the subject of our next Conference, and therefore not now to be anticipated; only I shall tell you, that It is a meer noise of ambiguous words to deceive the heedless that cannot search out the meaning of them. 1. We not only *Pretend*, but *Profess* and *prove* that our *Christian Religion* is altogether *Infallible*. For which end I have written divers Treatises my self. 2. And we profess that all the mystical Church of Christ (that is all sincere Christians) do truly and *Infallibly* believe all that is *Essential to Christianity*, and as much of the *Integrals* as they can know. 3. And we profess that the *Catholick Church-Visible* (that is, All professors of Christianity in the world) do profess all these *Essentials of Christianity*, and are *Infallible in this profession*.

But we hold withall, that there is no particular Church,

Church, or Bishop, no Synod or Council, that is so *Infallible*, but that, &c. They that hold to the *Essentials*, may misunderstand and err about some *Integrals*: 2. And those persons have no Certainty that they shall not err by Heresie or Apostacy from the *Essentials* themselves: So that the Church is *Infallible*, because it is *essentiated* by believing an *Infallible Word*, which who ever believeth not, ceaseth to be of the Church: not Gods Word *infallible*, because the Church or any number of men believe it, or say Its true: For Truth is before Knowledge and Faith: As Aristotle was a Philosopher, because he understood and taught the doctrine of real Philosophy, and not that doctrine called *Physicks* or Philosophy, because that Aristotle knew or taught it.

But, alas, What work shall I shew you when I come to open their bewildring uncertainties?

D. But to deal freely with you, methinks their way of measuring out the *Necessaries* in Faith and Religion according to mens various parts and opportunities, seemeth to me more satisfactory than yours, who fix upon certain points (as the *Baptismal Covenant*) as *Essentials*. For there is great diversity of mens Capacities.

R. This cometh from confounding several Questions as if they were all one.

1. It is one Question, What is the Christian Religion?

2. It is another Question, Whether the Christian Religion be absolutely necessary to the salvation of all those to whom it was never competently revealed?

3. And it is another Question, Whether more than the *Essentials* of Christian Religion be not necessary

to the salvation of many who have opportunity to know more? Alas, what work doth Confusion make in the world!

To the first, It is evident that as Mahometanism is a thing which may be defined, so much more may Christianity: Who that writeth of the several Religions of the world, Ethnick, Jewish, Mahometan, and Christian, do not take them to be distinguishable and discernable? Especially when Christ hath summed up Christianity into a Covenant, and given it us in express words, and affixed a flat promise of salvation to the true Covenanters, and the Church hath ever called our Baptism, our Christening? Is Christianity Nothing? If Something, Why may it not be defined, and differenced from all false Religions? And if so, It hath its Essential Constitutive parts: All this is plain to Children that will see.

2. And then as to the second question, it concerneth not our Controversie at all. It is but Whether any Infidels may be saved? Or any that are no Christians? And if it could be proved, that any are saved that are no Christians, do you thereby prove that they are Christians, or members of the Christian Church? or that Christianity is not a Religion which may be defined?

3. And as to the third question, We are on all sides agreed in it, That they that have more than the naked Essentials of Christianity revealed to them aptly, are bound to believe more: Yea, it is hardly conceivable that any one should know and believe the Essentials only, and no more: It is not Essential to the Christian Covenant or Christianity to know that the Name of Christs Mother was Mary: or that Pontius Pilate was the man that condemned him; And if

an Ignorant man thought that his continuance in the Grave was four dayes, I do not think that this would damn his soul to Hell: (Much less the not believing that *Mary* dyed a Virgin.) And yet it is not like that any man should come to the *Essentials* of Christianity by any such way, as should acquaint him with no one of these, or any point besides the said *Essentials*.

And yet it is certain for all this, that he that truly receiveth the *Essentials*, and is true to the *Baptismal Covenant*, shall be saved, whatsoever else he want: But it is as true, that he that Receiveth the *Essentials*, will (from the same principles and obligations) receive more, when it is aptly notified to him: And he that truly Covenanteth, will honestly keep the Covenant he maketh; which bindeth him still to learn of Christ. But if any man be saved without the *Essentials*, he must be saved without Christianity.

*D.* But you know that they distinguish of faith *Explicite* and *Implicite*: He may be *Implicite* a Christian that believeth not the *Essentials Explicite*; as long as he believeth that which would infer them, if they were made known to him to be indeed the Word of God.

*R.* Thus do Words abuse and cheat the ignorant: Could you but read their own *Dr. Holden* before cited in his *Analyf. fid.* you would find this distinction justly rendred by him shameful and ridiculous, according to their common sense and use of it; and the truer sense delivered and vindicated. An *Implicite faith* or *Knowledge* we confess to be true, as it is opposed to 1. A *distinct*, or 2. To a *well-expressed* faith or *Knowledge*. For it is *Implicite*, 1. As to the *Object*, when a man knoweth the whole matter, but not

by *distinct parts*: As a man may know a Cup of water, and not know how many drops or drams it is; or he may know a sentence, and not know how many letters are in it. 2. Or it is *Implicit* as to the

Apply this to Mr. Johnsons Rejoinder on this Point, and you will see his Vanity.

*Act*, when it is yet but a crude imperfect conception, and the thing is really known, but not the *Logical notions*,

or Grammatical names, either the *verba oris* or *mentis* by which it should be expressed: So that the man cannot notify his knowledge to another. These two are called *Implicit*; the first signifieth *Confused and General Knowledge*, and the other *Imperfect and undigested*.

But to call that *Implicit* faith or knowledge, which extendeth only to some Principles, and not to the *Conclusions themselves*, is 1. To Call *No-knowledge and faith*, by the name of knowledge and faith, 2. And by their application to confound the World and the Church, and to make all the Infidels and Heathens to be Christians; and every Fool a Philosopher.

For, 1. All men of Reason know these two Principles (who own a God), 1. That God is not a Lye, but all his Word is True. 2. That all the Truths in the world are Gods; Some way or other revealed by him. Therefore, if they knew that the Gospel were Gods word, they would believe it: or if they knew it to be one of those Truths that are in the world, they would take it to be of God. And thus all Infidels, and Turks, and Pagans may (by such abuse) be called *Implicit Christians*.

But why then do the Papists burn the Protestants, when if their Religion were true, we are all *Implicitly*

cirely

*citely Papists.* For we believe, 1. That all Divine Revelations are True; 2. And that all those are Infallible whom God hath promised to make Infallible; 3. And that all those must be believed and obeyed whom God hath commanded us to believe and obey; 4. And that we must not forsake that Church which God hath commanded us to adhere to; 5. And that all our Lawful Pastors must be revered and submitted to; 6. And all their lawful Precepts obeyed; 7. And all Gods Sacraments holily used; 8. And all Traditions from the Apostles to the Churches received; with many more such: Only we know not that the Pope is our Pastor, or that his Councils are the Church, or have a promise of Infallibility; and so of the rest. And yet we must burn for it, if they can procure it. And yet he is a true believer Implicitely who believeth not the Essentials of Christianity.

But the *Design* which is predominant here is too visible, when this Implicit faith cometh to be described: For it is not a Belief in *God*, or in *Christ* only that will serve the turn, but it must be a belief in *the Church*, and *their Church*, and their Pope too, or else it will not do. The Implicit faith is the explicite belief of these three Articles: 1. All Gods Word is true: 2. All that is Gods Word, which the Church tells us is Gods Word. 3. The Pope and his Council and Subjects are this Church. And yet this man must be supposed if he know no more, *per impossibile*, not to know that there is a Christ, or who he is as to his Person or Office, or what he hath done, or will do for us: And yet that he hath a *Vicar* and a *Church*. Or else they may know Christ and Christianity before they know that there is any

Pope or Church, and then the Pope hath lost the Game.

*D.* But if Popery be so senseless a thing as you make it, how come so great a number of persons of all ranks and qualities, Kings, Nobles, Learned men, and Religiously-disposed persons to embrace it? Have not they souls to save or lose as well as you? and do they not lay all their hopes of Heaven upon it? and can such persons, and so many, be so mad and senseless?

*R.* Do we need thus to ramble round about, as if we would doubt of the *thing* till we know the *Causes* of it? when *we see* and they all confess that they deny all our senses? Will you not believe that there is a Sun, till you know what it is made of? Or whether the Sea ebb and flow, till you *know* the *Causes* of it? I pray you tell me,

*Q. 1.* Do you think that the Mahometan's is not a very foolish Religion, and their *foundation* ( the pretended Mission of their Prophet ) without any shew of truth; and his Alcoran ( if ever you read it ) a heap of Non-sense and Confusion?

*D.* Yes: I think it deserveth no better thoughts.

*R.* And do you not know that ( though it arose not till about six hundred years after Christ ) much more of the world is Mahometan than Christian? And are there not far Greater Emperours and Princes Mahometans than any that are Christians? And have not all these souls to save or lose? And do they not all venture their souls upon that Religion? Why then is not your argument here as good for Mahometanism as for Popery?

*D.* Though the Emperours of *Constantinople*, the Great Mogul, the Persian, Tartarian Mahometans,



tans, &c. be all Great as to their vast Dominions, yet they are barbarous and unlearned in comparifon of the Papifts.

R. 1. It is not becaufe they have not as much wit as we : but becaufe they think that our *laborious wordy* kind of learning, is an abufe of wit, and againft true Policy, ludicrously or contentioufly diverting mens minds and time from thofe employments which they think more manly and profitable to the Commonwealth; Though no doubt, but they do err more unmanly on that extream. But I further ask you,

Q. 2. Do you not think that the Common Religion of the Heathens is very unworthy for any wife man to venture his foul upon? If you have but read how it is described by the Antient Chriftians, *Justin, Athenagoras, Origen, Arnobius, Minutius Fælix, Tertullian, Lactantius, Eusebius, Auguftine, &c.* you will fay that they thought it a ridiculous unmanly Religion.

D. I think no better of it than they did.

R. And 1. Do you not know that almoft all the world was then Heathen and Idolaters? Alas, what was *Judea* (lefs than *England*) to all the world? Was not the *Roman Empire*, and *Alexanders* before that, far Greater than any Chriftian Prince hath now? And to this day, are not four fixth parts of the whole world (at leaft) Heathens and Idolaters? *Brierwoods* Calculation is, that if you divide the world into thirty parts, nineteen are Heathen, fix Mahometans, and five only Chriftians of all forts: befides the vaft unknown parts of the world, which are not like to have any Religion of fupernatural Revelation.

2. And do you not know, that *Athens* and *Rome* Heathen were no Barbarians, but of most polite literature, and the Fathers of the Learning now in use; and that when the Christians arose among them, they accounted them Barbarians? And at this day, and long before us, the *Chinenses* have been addicted to Arts and Literature: And the *Brachmanes* and *Bonzii* are no Barbarians. And have not all these souls to save or lose? And are all these so mad as to cast away their souls upon a senseless contemptible Religion? If your reason be good, how much more will it hold for the Heathens, than the Papists? Alas, what a handful are the Papists in comparison of the present Idolaters! much more in comparison of the *Ancient Heathen world*, before *Christianity* and *Mahometanism* dispossessed them of those parts which they now hold!

With what greater shew of advantage did the Heathens use the Arguments which the Papists do now put their trust in, and lay their Cause upon!

1. Do they talk of *Antiquity*? Why, it was the *Novelty* of *Christianity* in comparison of Heathenism through the world, which was it that hardned them to condemn and persecute it.

2. Do they talk of *Universality* and *Consent*? Alas, how little a part of the world were the Christians at first, and are the Papists now, in comparison of the Heathens, then and now?

3. Do they talk of *Greatness*, *Empire*, *Acts* and *Learning*? How little are they as to the first, to the Heathen Empires? And for Learning, they received it of them: And *Aristotle* still is the Schoolmens Oracle. And yet doubtless all these advantages are not sufficient to disprove the follies of Heathenism,

nism, nor the badness of their Religion? And yet will so much less serve to support the credit of senseless Popery?

D. But *Christians* may well expect greater helps from God, than Heathens or Mahometans: Therefore that so many Great and Learned and Religious *Christians* should go such a senseless way to another world, methinks seemeth strange.

R. And are not Greeks, Armenians, Syrians, Abasines and Protestants, all *Christians* as well as they? Their proud schismatical unchristening all but the subjects of the Pope, is a silly proof that we are no *Christians*, or that they are any better than others; unless Malignity, uncharitableness and Schism be the true Excellency.

1. And are not other *Christians* *More* than the Papists? Bishop *Bramhall* reckons the Papists to be about the fifth part of *Christians*: Suppose they be a third part? They are still the *Minor* part.

2. And are not the Protestants as Learned as the Papists? Why then will not your argument hold *against them* as well as *for them*? Have not all these *Christians* souls to save or lose? And do they not rake that for the true Religion on which they trust their souls?

D. But though all these set together are more than the Church of *Rome*, yet no one Sect of them is so great; and what matter is it how many various Sects are?

R. 1. The Greek Church is judged by wise men, to be yet bigger than the Roman, even in this its broken state: But there is no doubt but it was much bigger long after the first division, before the Turk did win the Eastern Empire.

2. But, if it were not so, your objection is frivolous. The Question is either of *Different Churches*, or of *Different opinions and parties in the same Church*. As to the first, There are but two opinions in the Christian world, that I know of, about the Constitution of the *Catholick Church*. The one is the opinion of the *Papists only*, & that *The Catholick Church is essentially constituted both of Christ, and the Pope as his Vicar and universal Monarch, with all his subjects*; as the *pars Imperans* and *pars subdita*.

The other is the judgement of all other Christians, ( that I know or hear of, ) that *The Catholick Church is essentially constituted only of Christ as the supreme Head, or King, or pars Imperans, and his subjects as the pars subdita*; & And that *Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, &c.* are but *Officiales & subditi primarii vel nobiles, constitutive parts indeed of their particular Churches* ( some humane, and some Divine ) but no essential parts of the *Catholick Church*.

& This is the Grand difference between the *Papists* and all other Christians in the World, *What the Catholick Church is? Whether it have any Constitutive Universal Head or Monarch besides Christ?* Now seeing that *Greeks, Abassines, Armenians* and all agree with us in this against the *Papists*, it is evident to them that are willing to see that we are all of the same *Catholick Church*, though not of the same particular Churches, nor all for the same Official Ministers; Because we are all for the same Constitutive Head, and his subjects as such, and agree in all the Essential parts. & So that our differences among all these parties or particular Churches or

Coun-

Countries is but the difference of *Opinions* and *parties* in one and the same Church; and not a difference of Catholick Churches (which can be but one.)

And if that be the question, I undertake to prove that there is no one Sect of Christians known under Heaven, that hath so many different opinions within it self, (if half so many,) nor have written half so much against one another, as the Papists have done.

3. But I must not here anticipate my further work: when I come to that, I shall shew you how *small* and how *disagreeing* a part of the Christian world the Papists are. I have elsewhere recited the words of their *Melchior Canus* who boasteth that the Papacy yet standeth, though almost all the world, and besides Princes, almost all the Bishops and Churches have fought against it. Was it then the Universal Church? And the words of *Reynerius* who saith, that the Churches of the *Armenians* and the others planted by the Apostles (without the Empire he meaneth) were not under the Pope of Rome. I shall, if I live to do that work, yet fuller shew you, that the Pope was but the chief Patriarch in one Empire, as the Archbishop of *Canterbury* is the chief Bishop in *England*; and that his General Councils were but General Assemblies of the Empire (inconsiderable occasional accidentals excepted), even as our Convocations, or the Scots General Assemblies were, though in a far larger Empire. But all this I have done already in other writings, beyond all reasonable contradiction.

D. Tell me then, how it cometh to pass that so many Princes, Nobles, Learned men, and Religious can be so marvellously deluded?

R. Alas

R. Alas poor man; You talk as if you knew not your self nor mankind ! how bad a thing corrupt unsanctified nature is ! Why do you not also ask, How cometh it to pass, that the far greatest part of the World (even five parts of six) are Heathens and Mahometanes ! and that most of the World are wilful self-destroyers ; many ruining their very bodies, Eating, and Drinking, and Whoring, and Idling them into Gout, Stone, Dropfies and an hundred Maladies : but far more ruining their souls. Why do you not also ask, How reasonable Creatures ( of all Professions ) are so worse than mad, as to sell their souls and everlasting hopes, for a dream and shadow, or for dirt and dung ; even for a few Cups or Morfels, or merry hours, which they know are like the mirth of drunkennes, which is quickly gone, and ends in sickness and in shame ! For a great Name, and a large attendance in their way to the grave ! For the *thoughts* and *breath* of mortal man ! And for that which all men first or last, are forced to call meer *Vanity* and *Vexation* ! Were not men mad in sin, had they never heard a Preacher, the sight of a dead Carcase and a grave would do more to make them sober and considerate, than is done with most. When most of the World will obstinately follow the Devil their enemy, by known sin to everlasting misery, against all the commands, exhortations, promises, threatenings, mercies and warnings of God himself, and all the perswasions of their truest friends, What wonder if the same men can be Papists or any thing ?

But I will tell you some of the particular Causes.

#### I. Abroad

I. Abroad in other Countries, there are all these Reasons easily discernible. 1. Who knoweth not how great an advantage *Education* hath, to form mens judgements to almost any thing, how bad soever? That which children receive, if it be not disagreeable to their sensible interest, how commonly and tenaciously do they follow? Whence is it that the whole Empires and Kingdoms of Pagans are all of one mind; and the Kingdoms of Mahometans of another? One Kingdom almost all Greek Christians and another Papists, and another Lutherans, and another Reformists, &c? Hath not education a great hand in this?

2. And the *custome* of the Countrey, and the *company* which they converse with, is of no small power with mens minds. Especially when men live where almost all are of a mind, they think that *concord* is a sign of *truth*, and *modesty* forbiddeth them to be wiser than all the Countrey.

3. And when they know few or none of another mind, how should they know what they are? And when they hear an hundred lies against them, and never hear them speak for themselves, they think that the Law of modesty, humanity and converse, oblige them to believe, that so Many, so Great, and so Learned and Religious persons will not impudently lie: When as perhaps the lye it self is a *Tradition* which the lyars received on the same terms in modest credulity from their teachers or fathers.

4. And specially, the Names of *Order*, *Government*, *Unity*, and *Concord*, deceive many millions of souls: For *Order* and *Unity* are justly amiable to nature it self. And the purblind know not an *Image* from a *Man*.

5. Especially



5. Especially when civil Wars, or Church discords have distracted the World, and made men weary of all that's *present*, and suspicious of all things, which seemed to have a hand in their disappointments; this maketh men hearken to any thing which pretendeth to *certain settlement, Order and peace*. Even as a man that by turning round is wheelsick, will lay hold on the next post or fixed thing, to keep him from falling down.

6. And when their Teachers make them believe, that all Christians besides them do live like madmen, in Sects and Schismes, distractedly tearing out one anothers throats, What wonder if this make men willing of any way which pretends to peace, and glad to run into any Cottage which will keep them from such a storm?

7. But the great cause is, 1. The *Blindness* of mens minds, 2. The *wickedness* of all unrenewed hearts, and 3. The *power of carnal Interest*.

1. Few men are of *great natural parts* for wit, and fewer *improve* them, by any serious study of things spiritual.

2. Almost all men study with the byas of *prejudice* and *partiality*, and as men that *would* have *one side* to be *right*, because it is for their worldly ends.

3. Sin Ruleth in most souls, and the enmity against God and his Laws prevaieth in carnal minds, *Rom.* 8. 6, 7, 8. And *enmity* is an ill student and seeker of truth; and friendship is an incompetent judge of sin.

4. None but a few self-denying persons can bear to be reproached as Hereticks and Schismaticks by all about them.

5. Especially

5. Especially the countenance or discountenance of *Great ones*, doth more with such than Heaven and Hell.

6. And that's not all, But he that will not be a Papist, in most of their Countreys must be *undone*, and in many must be *rackt*, *tormented* and *burnt*: And it is but few that have learnt to go to so high a price for truth, and to be Religious at such a rate.

8. Therefore it is a thing utterly *unknown* among them, *who is heartily* a Papist, and *who not*. For when men *must take on them* to be Papists or be *undone*, or *burnt*, millions will seem to be such that are not. For,

9. Most of the World have *no Religion in truth*, and power, to overcome the world and flesh: and therefore will seem to be of that Religion, which hath the upper hand, and serveth their turns.

10. Yea, the very *Belief* of the *Immortality* of the *soul*, the *Resurrection* and the *life to come*, is feeble, if not unsound and lifeless, in the most of men: And so is the *Belief* of the *Christian faith*: And a man that doubteth whether there be *another life or not*, will make as sure as he can of the pleasures of *this present* life. And I fear that this is the case of no small number of Papists: to think, [“I know not whether there be any other life  
“of retribution: I rather think that there is none:  
“But lest it should prove true, I will be of some  
“Religion: And where can I be with more ease  
“and safety, than in that which my Rulers and  
“Teachers and the whole Countrey say is right?  
“If it prove otherwise, I hope God will excuse  
“me, while I obey my Governours, and do as the  
“most

“most do.] He that much doubteth of the truth of *Christianity it self*, may easily fall in with any Sect which seemeth for his interest. I fear *Melancthon* too truly said, that *Italians maintain that Christ is in the Sacrament, when they do not believe that he is in Heaven.*

11. And many *Nicodemites* think, that a man needs not expose himself to danger for his faith, but may keep it to himself, and do as his neighbours do: especially where they have no other society to joyn with, they think it better to joyn with the Popish Churches than none.

12. And I have reason to think that it is but few among the multitude, that *understand indeed* what the Papists hold, while they go with them in the *general Name* and profession: And in particular about Transubstantiation: When even the subtle Schoolmen are not agreed of its proper sense; (as *Durandus* his instance for one doth prove.) I do not think that one of an hundred that receiveth their Eucharist, doth in his heart believe, that *It is not Bread*: But some think that their Church it self *meaneth otherwise*: And some say, [It is not for such as I to contradict them and dispute; but I will leave every one to think as he will; and so will I.]

13. And as for *Princes* and *Lords* abroad, Those that have once escaped Popery will take heed how they entertain it again, unless *lust and folly* have sold them for a prey: But they that live where their *subjects* are *Papists*, dare not venture to shake so great a fabrick, lest they overthrow themselves:

For 1. People are tumultuous;

2. The

2. The Popish Clergie are rich and powerful and exceeding numerous.

3. Religion is a thing that men are tender and tenacious of, who are seriously of any.

4. The Popish doctrine of deposing and killing excommunicate Kings, maketh many Princes flatter the Priests, for fear of losing their lives. They think that it is better make some advantage of the Popes friendship, than to have such an enemy, whose Knives and poison have easie access, and whose armies we must watch against in peace, as in a continued War, and we know not when they are in our own houses or near us, nor where nor when we are in safety.

14. And, alas, the Great ones of the World have the greatest Temptations, and not the weakest lusts and passions, and have more of worldly and carnal Interest to carry them away.

15. And the Papists Religion is notably suited to their lusts and carnal ends: All which, and much more, may tell you that it no wonder, that so many forreign Princes, and States and Nobles can cleave to so senseless a way as Popery.

¶ De II. But how come so many among us in England to turn Papists of late years, where Popery is discountenanced by the King, Parliament and Laws?

¶ R. Many of the same Causes do this, which I need not rehearse. And 1. Too many both Noble and ignoble are prepared by their Lusts, and by a vicious life. There are many things in Popery which greatly accommodate a carnal mind and a debauched guilty Conscience, which the Christian Protestant Religion affordeth not. And a profligate flagitious

flagitious person, is likeliest to be *forfaken of God*, and to be given up to believe a lye, seeing they received not the truth in the love of it, that they might be saved, 2 *Theff.* 2. 10, 11, 12. I fear nothing so much, as lest men turn *Heart-Infidels* and *Tongue-Papists* (as the suitablest Reserve, left *Christian Religion* and the *life to come*, should prove a truth). And indeed great sins Cry for great Vengeance: And what Greater than for *Mind, Will* and *Life* to be forfaken of God?

2. And alas, except Lawyers, Physicians and others bred up to Studies and Employments, how few are there of Nobility or Gentry that are *hard studying* men! And the great Mysteries of Religion will not be *well learned* and *defended*, by a life of eating, drinking, playing, jesting, gaming, hawking, hunting, visitings of empty company, lustfulness, worldliness, or vain-glorious pomp. No men grow *wise* or *Christians* indeed by such a course.

3. And indeed the *Popish Priests* are more *industrious* than too many of our *Incumbent Ministers*; for which they are Commendable in their way. The Erroneous are oft more zealous than the Orthodox. And they that apprehend themselves between fear and hope, are usually more *industrious* than they that by possession are *secure*: which maketh the *lower side* so oft get up, and the *upper side* go down. And I would I might not say, that our Ministers are too few of them *able to deal* with a trained Sophister. Some are unable in this *particular cause*, because they take it as a baffled pack of notorious Errors, and thought that few sober persons were in danger of it: And so they

they have (honestly) bent their studies and labours to the winning of sensual persons from their sins; and are unfurnished in the Popish Controversies; knowing that they can refer them to multitudes of Books, which are unanswerable. But alas, too many also are unable through *meer ignorance, lowness of parts, and gross insufficiency or negligence*, not only in this, but other parts of their Ministerial work.

4. And we have incurred no small damage and danger, by *ignorant Over-doing* against the Papists: Partly with the *self-wise Sectaries*, calling many laudable or blameless things, by the Name of *Popery, Antichristianity and Idolatry*, because they are cross to their pre-judging partial conceits: And partly by some *unsound doctrines*, which some defend as parts of the Protestant Religion: And partly by *magnifying verbal differences*, and making a noise about them as if they were *real*, and such as salvation lyeth on: For want of *skill to state a controversy*, and discern a *verbal* difference from a *real*. And when a Papist can but shew their Novices one such palpable error in the Writings of a Protestant; What sad work will he make with it? and still harp upon that string, and perswade the people that the rest of our differences are such like. And thus many *Overdoing* well-meaning ignorant men both Ministers and people, have unwittingly done as much to harden Papists, and increase their numbers, almost as if Satan had hired them as Spies, to betray the Churches and Cause of Christ: Yea, and if one better studied in these points, shall go a foundier and

N

more

more successful way to work, and take these weapons out of the Papists hands, which some ignorant Protestants have given them, the same mens blind zeal will rage against them, ( as some did against *Chillingworth*, *Anthony Wotton*, and divers others our greatest Champions ) as if it were not *themselves* but *these*, that were befriending Popery. So that they neither *can* confute them soundly themselves, nor will suffer others, but zealous Protestants assault Christs ablest servants at their backs, while their faces are towards the adversaries whom they oppose.

5. But nothing among us ( except *Ignorance* and *wickedness* ) increaseth them more, than the scandal of our *numerous*, and some of them *abominable Sects*. When the people see many zealous professors turn Quakers, or Ranters, or Seekers, or Antinomians, or Socinians, or Familists; and shall see the more tolerable parties ( Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independant, Erastian, Separatists, and Anabaptists ) condemning, backbiting, reproaching and making odious ( if not persecuting ) one another, and shunning ( many of them ) the Communion of one another, as they do the Papists. This makes them think, that they must seek some surer soberer way than any of us have yet found: and the Papists set in and tell them, [ " All these are branches broken off from the true Vine and withered; This it is to depart from the Catholick Church; when they are once gone thence, there is no stop or consistence, till they crumble all to dust and atomes: You must be come *Roman* Catholicks, or go mad: You see

" to



"to what confusion all others tend : If you once  
 "leave our Church, you will never know where  
 "to settle : Which Seet will you be of ? If  
 "an Independant, why not an Anabaptist ?  
 "If an Anabaptist, why not an Antinomian ?  
 "How will you ever know which one of all  
 "these is in the right ] ? All this is easily an-  
 "swered by a man of understanding ; But to  
 the ignorant Vulgar, it seemeth unanswer-  
 ble. And alas, how many have given them  
 this scandal ? *Wo be to some by whom offence*  
*cometh.*

6. But the Contentions of our Clergie ad-  
 vantage them more than the divisions of the  
 people : when we are of many interests, and  
 many parties, and proceed to make each other  
 contemptible and odious : especially when we come  
 to hinder each other from the work of our Mi-  
 nistry. A house and Kingdom divided cannot  
 stand : Christ tells us that the Devil himself is  
 not so foolish, as to divide his Kingdom. *All*  
*our consent and best endeavour is too little to*  
*save mens souls from sin and error.* And when  
*one part is cast by, and each part by contention*  
*hindereth the other :* the Papists have the far  
 easier work. When one part are not to come  
 within five miles of Cities or Corporations,  
 where Papists are, and those that may come near  
 them are too few, and many too indisposed, or  
 negligent in resisting them, so that we are all  
 overdone by their Priests in constant diligence,  
 (especially with the Greater rank of men, with  
 whom one part of our Ministers, have almost ut-

little inclination as opportunity to converse,) no wonder, if the *Roman* work go on.

7. And, alas, how great advantage have they made of our late calamitous *Civil Wars*, and manifold scandalous *Rebellions*? Though indeed it was the terror of their murdering about two hundred thousand in *Ireland* (of which see *Bishop Jones*, *Sir John Temple*, and the *Earl of Orery* against *Welsh*;) which frightened those that I was acquainted with; out of their peace, and almost out of their wits here in *England*, yet dead men are not heard on Earth, and their service for the King in *England* serveth not only for a Cloke for that, but for an advantage against many that stand in their way. In all *Civil Wars*, if the *Clergy* be drawn in to own several Causes (especially if they own an ill Cause) who ever prevaileth, Religion suffereth by it; while one part of them are laid by, or hindered by the other.

8. And though God hath greatly obliged this Nation to thankfulness, by preserving our Superiours so much from Popery as he hath done, yet some of their names are injuriously abused, to entice men to the Popish way, as if it had so much countenance and patronage, that Interest might invite them to it.

9. And the World is lyable to changes, and weary of holding long in one way: The name of Antiquity especially in Religion is venerable, with all; but yet it is Novelty that pleaseth in the Matter. And when Popery is to us a New way honoured with the name of The old Religion, it is a taking bait.

10. But

10. But the grand cause of all, is, the *common peoples Ignorance*, as being ungrounded in their own Religion; and their *badness*, who measure all by carnal Interests, and all *our great and manifold sins*, by which we have forfeited Gods presence and his grace, and provoked him to leave us to the shame and ruine of our own lusts and delusions to undoe our selves. Great sins bring great plagues. And most men are of *their Religion* who have the *greatest interest* in their *estimation* and *affections*, or that have greatest *advantage* on them by *constant nearness, familiarity, kindred, kindness* or *power to do them good or hurt* in the World.

And therefore to your question *Why so many of late turn Papists*, I shall but now concludingly answer you, as I begun with you, concerning the Cause of your own doubts; They that have long lived under the light of the holy Gospel, and among the mercies which have blest this Land, and yet have been sincerely no true Christians, but loved their fleshly lusts and pleasures, and their wealth and worldly honour, more than God, or holiness, or Heaven, it is no wonder that they easily change their party, and can be, in *fiding*, of *any Religion* who are in *sincerity* of *none*; and if God forsake their understandings, and give them up to senseless and unreasonable opinions, who would not live according to the knowledge which they had, nor obey the truth which was clearly opened to them. And such hypocrites and perfidious rebels against Christ, all Protestants do confess themselves to have been, who turn Papists, and know what they do: Because they *profess* to go from a *state of damnation, into a Church* out of

which there is no salvation ; if the Popes judgement be as powerful in Heaven, as it is at Rome.

D. But is there no hope of ending these lamentable differences, and removing the scandal of Infidels hereby ? or at least of living together like Neighbours without seeking each others blood or ruine ?

R. 1. Yes ; when God shall by his Providence take down the worldly Greatness and Advantages of the Papacy, and level the King of Rome with the true Pastors of his Church, and turn the usurping Monarch of all the World into a true Bishop ; that so worldly Power, honour and wealth, may not be stronger arguments with their party than Heaven and Hell, and Gods commands. Till then their Great twisted Interest is like to rule them, and keep them in the errors into which it hath involved them. Especially while their pretended *Infallibility* (against all sense and reason) is their strength, which maketh them incurable in any error which they once embrace.

2. But yet I did in the second Part of my *Key for Catholicks*, long ago shew the terms on which we may live like neighbours, if not like Christians, if their principles would allow their minds, to be but peaceable, and give dissenters leave to live.

And I still profess that might we but secure our selves and our posterity, I am none of those that would have the least injury, much less cruelty exercised upon any man for being a Papist : If they will live peaceably with me, or but give me leave, I will live peaceably with them. And I doubt not but

but as there are some among them truly fearing God (though corrupt with the errors of their education) so there are more that ~~are~~ of kind and civil natures, which their ill opinions cannot make fierce and sanguinary nor overcome. And none of them, I think, shall be more loving, kind and peaceable to me, than I will be to him.

And I confess I have a greater respect and honour for those whose Ancestors have transmitted Popery to them under the name of the True Catholick faith, and who live according to what they know (though perhaps in blind zeal they hate me and such others for the Interest of their way,) than I have for those that seemed once Protestants, and by filthy debauched lives have made it seem *needful* or *convenient* for them to turn Papists; that they may have a seeming Religion and Priests pardons to quiet or deceive their Consciences; or than I have for those Papists who live in drunkenness, lust and common lying and prophane swearing, while yet they seem to be Religious and regardful of God and their souls; or than I have for those Priests who befriend such mens wickedness for the increase and interest of their Church.

Yea, I truly profess that if I know a truly Godly conscionable charitable Papist, I must, I will love and honour him far more than an ungodly, unconscionable, uncharitable Protestant. And as far as I can discern, both Ministers and private Christians (but especially Ministers) whom I most converse with, are of the same mind.

D. But is there no way possible to bring them fairly off, in this gross business of Transubstantiation,

tion, without putting them upon the disclaiming of the Popes and General Councils Infallibility?

R. I am not bound to devise accommodations to strengthen them in their other errors, if I could. But yet I would cure any error in any, though they intend their own cure to an evil end. I cannot be persuaded but their understanding men are sorry at the heart that the *Laterane* Council hath drawn them into such a snare, by making Transubstantiation an Article of their faith; and that they are very angry at them, and wish that it had never been done: but being done they must take on them to believe it, lest they pull down with their foundation all their fabrick. I doubt not but they are troubled and ashamed to read the Schoolmens disputes of Transubstantiation, exposing Christianity to the Infidels scorn, which this Council hath most occasioned. I know not how to bring them off, unless they will hearken to what Dr. *Taylor* in his *Dissuative from Popery*, and Dr. *Heylin*, and Dr. *Pierston* and Dr. *Gunning* in the Dispute, have said against the Validity of that *Laterane* Council (could they but spare the Canon for deposing Temporal Lords, and dispossessing them of their Dominions, and absolving all their Papists subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance and exterminating the rest; Yea it would be more serviceable to them at last with Princes, to retract that also, than to keep it.) Their best way is to take the help of these pretences, and condemn the contrary Reasons of Mr. *Tetter* and his fellow Disputant against the fore said Doctors, and

and expunge that Council out of *Binnin*, *Surin* and the rest who number it with the approved Councils ; and because *Matth. Paris* and others say that some at the Council thought the Canons burdensome, and they were brought in by the Pope, and hastily read, &c. therefore say, that They were not passed at least *Conciliariter*, which you know is a word that serveth their turn against another Council which they dislike.

D. But what shall they do with following Councils, especially that at *Trent*, which say the same ?

R. The best shifts that I know are, 1. To do as they do about the condemning of Pope *Honorius* as a Heretick. They say that a General Council and Pope too may err in a matter of fact ; and so they did in judging of *Honorius* his meaning : So they may say, that the Council of *Trent* did decree this as an Article of faith, only because they thought that the Church so held it : which was because they thought that the General approved Council of *Laterane* had so decreed it. But now finding that it was not so decreed there, the error in matter of fact ceasing, which was the supposition, the doctrinal error proveth to be no Article of faith, or *Conciliariter decretum*.

2. Or if this will not do, they are best yet stretch the words of *Rome* and *Trent*, to a more tolerable signification, and say, That it is not the ceasing of the substance of Bread and Wine which is meant ; but the changing it into a Relative new form : And so, as the *Whole substance*  
of



of a man is changed from being a meer Common man, into a King, a Bishop, a Doctor, without any cessation of his Humanity; but only *quia forma ultima denominat*, he is not any more to be called meerly *A Man*, but *A King, A Bishop, &c.* Or, as the whole substance of a piece of Gold is changed into Currant Coin by the Kings Stamp, &c. So the whole substance of Bread is turned into the ( Representative ) Body of Christ, and the whole substance of Wine into his ( Representative ) blood; which change they call *Transubstantiation*.

But why should I give counsel to men that will not thank me for it, and that obstinately refuse much better?

D. But why speak you nothing of their denying the people the Cup? I thought you would principally have fastned on that.

R. Because it is no part of this present Controversie, which I was first to handle, though it concern the same Sacrament: But it is such an instance, as serveth to tell those of the world that will understand, what horrid *unreasonable, audacious arrogance and Usurpation and Treason against God and the true Head of the Church*, this pretended Monarch of the world, and his pretended Catholick Church ( the Popish Sect ) are guilty of: considering,

1. That it is as *essential* a part of the Sacrament as the *Bread* is: For Christ hath made no difference,

2. It hath the same Institution and express Command: He that said, [ *Take, Eat* ] said also [ *Drink* ]

[ *Drink ye all of this :* ] He hath said, [ *Do this in remembrance of me* ] of One as well as of the Other.

3. Therefore to take away an *Essential part*, is to take away the Sacrament, and make it another thing. As it is not a humane body that hath not both *Head and Heart* : So here,

4. Therefore by the same authority they might have continued the *Cup*, and taken away the *Bread* ; or have taken away both.

5. And on the same reason they might have taken away Baptism, and all Christs positive Institutions. And for ought I know the Ministry it self as instituted,

6. But then *Gersons* question, *de auferabilitate Papæ* would be next to be debated : For were he of *Christs own Institution* ( as he is not ) it is no more than the Cup in the Lords Supper. Could he but prove an Institution of his Papacy as evidently, who would not be his Subject ? If you say, But who should take him down, if it might be done ? I answer, Kings in their own Kingdoms, and his own General Councils, The Kings of *France, Spain, &c.* may easily prove, that they have more power to cast out the Pope, than he hath to cast out half Christs Sacrament : And they may better forbid their own Subjects to obey a forreign Usurper, than *he* can forbid all the world to obey Christ.

7. And for all this, the wit of man can hardly devise *What Reason they have to do it ?* What point of their Religion ? What Interest of their own did engage them to it ? Unless it be their Interest

Interest to shew that they are *Above Christ* and the Scripture, I do not yet discern their reason.

8. And yet they have, with Resolution and obstinacy, persisted herein divers hundreds of years, and denyed the requests of Emperours, Nobles, and great part of several Kingdoms in this point.

This and the leaving out the second Commandment, seem to be of purpose to shew that they are above the Maker of the Ten Commandments and of the Gospel. How long Lord shall Tyranny oppress the Nations of the Earth, and the *Honour* and *Domination* and *Wills* of Rebels, prevail to tread down Truth and Godliness, and keep the notice of thy salvation from the sinful miserable world; whilst yet we daily pray by thy Command, that *Thy Name may be Hallowed, Thy Kingdome come, and Thy Will be done, on Earth as it is done in Heaven?*

Whether the Pope be the Antichrist meant in the Scripture (by that name) or not, you see that my passing it by doth shew my cautelousness in resolving (as *Zanchy* and others before me have done), because I am confessedly so far un-studied or ignorant of the sense of the *Revelations* and some other Scripture Prophecies, as that I must leave such cases to such as *Bishop Downame* and others that have deeper insight into them: Every man should be best at that which he hath most studied. But I must needs say, that though I take it to be indispenfible duty, to keep up all due charity to all professed Christians; such instances as these which I have here opened do utterly

terly disable me from confuting that man, who shall assert that this pretended Vicar of Christ, and King or Monarch of the world, ( and so King of Kings, and Lord of Lords ) is an abominable Usurper, and insolent Traytor, against God, and the true King and Head of the Universal Church. How long will Princes and Prelates, Learned and Unlearned be deluded by him, or fear Power? And when shall he be restrained from hindering Christs Gospel, and the Peace and Concord of the Christian world?

---

*FINIS.*

---